



1-1-2015

Hidden in Plain Sight: Martial and the Greek Epigrammatic Tradition

Joseph M. Lucci

University of Pennsylvania, jbirdl@aol.com

Follow this and additional works at: <http://repository.upenn.edu/edissertations>



Part of the [Classical Literature and Philology Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Lucci, Joseph M., "Hidden in Plain Sight: Martial and the Greek Epigrammatic Tradition" (2015). *Publicly Accessible Penn Dissertations*. 1864.

<http://repository.upenn.edu/edissertations/1864>

This paper is posted at ScholarlyCommons. <http://repository.upenn.edu/edissertations/1864>

For more information, please contact libraryrepository@pobox.upenn.edu.

Hidden in Plain Sight: Martial and the Greek Epigrammatic Tradition

Abstract

Martial, perhaps the best-known author of Latin epigram, has enjoyed a resurgence of scholarly attention over the past two decades, and much has been made of his self-professed debt to earlier Latin epigrammatists, especially Catullus. Less prevalent, however, has been discussion of how he relates to authors of Greek epigram, which may not be surprising given that Martial passes over the Greek epigrammatic tradition in nearly total silence. This dissertation seeks to explain the silence. Through close readings of specific poems by Martial, both in themselves and alongside epigrams by his Greek predecessors, I argue that he has fashioned an intentionally ambivalent attitude toward the Greek tradition. Martial contends with a fundamentally Roman literary condundrum – he must negotiate the inevitable and irreconcilable tension between acknowledging the importance of his Greek predecessors and asserting his own claim to superiority over them. But Martial, I suggest, relishes such tensions, depicting Greece and Greek epigram as inconsistent and even bipolar entities which he can then exploit as sources of humor or self-aggrandizement. I claim that Martial's suppression of the Greeks is willful; it in part offers a playful challenge to his educated audience to hunt for allusions, and in part contributes to his invention of a purely Roman epigrammatic tradition over which he himself reigns. Martial's engagement with the Greek tradition spans hundreds of years and several subgenres of Greek epigram, three of which I have examined more or less chronologically in this study. My four chapters offer an overview of Martial's treatment of Greek language, art, and literature within the Epigrams, and discuss how he interacts with Greek inscribed, erotic, and skoptic epigram. I ultimately reveal how Martial imagines for his audience a bipolar Greek epigrammatic tradition, deftly balancing himself between the two poles: at times he respectfully embraces his participation in the rich and varied history of Greek epigram, and at times he irreverently attempts to invert, subvert, or erase this history altogether, all for the entertainment of his well-educated readers, for whom his engagement with the Greek tradition would no doubt have been hidden in plain sight.

Degree Type

Dissertation

Degree Name

Doctor of Philosophy (PhD)

Graduate Group

Classical Studies

First Advisor

James Ker

Keywords

epigram, Greek epigram, Latin poetry, Martial

Subject Categories

Classical Literature and Philology | Classics

HIDDEN IN PLAIN SIGHT: MARTIAL AND THE GREEK EPIGRAMMATIC
TRADITION

Joseph M. Lucci

A DISSERTATION

in

Classical Studies

Presented to the Faculties of the University of Pennsylvania

in

Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the

Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

2015

Supervisor of Dissertation

James Ker

Associate Professor of Classical Studies

Graduate Group Chairperson

Emily Wilson

Associate Professor of Classical Studies

Dissertation Committee

Joseph Farrell, Professor of Classical Studies

Ralph Rosen, Professor of Classical Studies

HIDDEN IN PLAIN SIGHT: MARTIAL AND THE GREEK EPIGRAMMATIC
TRADITION

© 2015

Joseph Michael Lucci

This work is licensed under the
Creative Commons Attribution-
NonCommercial-ShareAlike 3.0
License

To view a copy of this license, visit
<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/2.0/>

filiolae nondum natae

*“Adgredere o magnos (aderit iam tempus) honores,
cara deum suboles, magnum Iovis incrementum!”*

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

It takes a village to write a dissertation, to coin a phrase, and mine is no exception. This study would never have been written if not for the help and support of many others, and the gratitude that I feel toward them should be in no way diminished by my inability to convey it adequately here.

My foremost thanks belong to my dissertation committee, whose thoughtful guidance over the past years has been a constant source of inspiration and motivation for me. James Ker, my supervisor, was the driving force behind the completion of this dissertation, and without his careful feedback, enlivening conversation, and (perhaps most importantly) kind-hearted disposition, I would even now still be writing my first chapter. James helped me to develop my understanding of Martial and Greek epigram during an independent study in the Fall of 2012, when this work was still a glimmer in my eye, and he remained diligently with me through the entire process no matter where I was, intellectually or physically. The other two members of my committee, Joe Farrell and Ralph Rosen, were no less instrumental in the evolution of this project, and their many contributions from distinct perspectives undeniably enhanced the final product. Many thanks as well to Joe for (inadvertently, no doubt) hooking me on Martial in our Latin poetry seminar, and to Ralph, who taught me, among many other things, that sometimes a joke is just a joke.

I am thankful also to the other faculty members of the Penn Classics department, especially Emily Wilson, who guided me unerringly through the formative stages of my study, and Cynthia Damon, whose passion for the Latin language was (and remains) an

important influence on my approach to literary analysis. Valuable feedback came also from my fellow graduate students in our dissertation workshop group, and I am ever grateful for the moral support of the two other members of my cohort, Lydia Spielberg and Jeff Ulrich, and the guidance of the cohort that preceded us, consisting of Heather Elomaa (a fellow epigram enthusiast), Anna Goddard, Joanna Kenty, and Kate Wilson.

I would also like to express my gratitude to my family, whose love and encouragement, while persistent throughout my life, have been particularly welcome over the course of my graduate school career. Special thanks to my always supportive and unconditionally loving parents, Charlie and Donna Lucci, to my sister Kayleigh, who would be annoyed if she were not included in this section, and to my grandparents, Jeanne Bombredi and the late Dominic Bombredi, who is surely looking down with relief that I finally finished school.

I owe perhaps the most of all to my wife Erica, without whom I would be lost. Her love, support, and commiseration, along with the occasional reminder that there is more to life than one's scholarship, kept me sane as I wrote this dissertation. Although she did not make it into my dedication, I have done this all for her no less than for myself. Finally, I am grateful to my daughter Emma, who was kind enough to hold off on being born until after this project was complete. I can only hope that someday she will read these acknowledgements and be embarrassed that she holds so prominent a position within them.

ABSTRACT**HIDDEN IN PLAIN SIGHT: MARTIAL AND THE GREEK EPIGRAMMATIC TRADITION**

Joseph M. Lucci

James Ker

Martial, perhaps the best-known author of Latin epigram, has enjoyed a resurgence of scholarly attention over the past two decades, and much has been made of his self-professed debt to earlier Latin epigrammatists, especially Catullus. Less prevalent, however, has been discussion of how he relates to authors of Greek epigram, which may not be surprising given that Martial passes over the Greek epigrammatic tradition in nearly total silence. This dissertation seeks to explain the silence. Through close readings of specific poems by Martial, both in themselves and alongside epigrams by his Greek predecessors, I argue that he has fashioned an intentionally ambivalent attitude toward the Greek tradition. Martial contends with a fundamentally Roman literary conundrum – he must negotiate the inevitable and irreconcilable tension between acknowledging the importance of his Greek predecessors and asserting his own claim to superiority over them. But Martial, I suggest, relishes such tensions, depicting Greece and Greek epigram as inconsistent and even bipolar entities which he can then exploit as sources of humor or self-aggrandizement. I claim that Martial's suppression of the Greeks is willful; it in part offers a playful challenge to his educated audience to hunt for allusions, and in part contributes to his invention of a purely Roman epigrammatic tradition over which he himself reigns. Martial's engagement with the Greek tradition

spans hundreds of years and several subgenres of Greek epigram, three of which I have examined more or less chronologically in this study. My four chapters offer an overview of Martial's treatment of Greek language, art, and literature within the *Epigrams*, and discuss how he interacts with Greek inscribed, erotic, and skoptic epigram. I ultimately reveal how Martial imagines for his audience a bipolar Greek epigrammatic tradition, deftly balancing himself between the two poles: at times he respectfully embraces his participation in the rich and varied history of Greek epigram, and at times he irreverently attempts to invert, subvert, or erase this history altogether, all for the entertainment of his well-educated readers, for whom his engagement with the Greek tradition would no doubt have been hidden in plain sight.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iv
ABSTRACT	vi
INTRODUCTION	1
I. Martalian Scholarship	4
II. Epigram as Genre	7
III. Martial, Latin Epigram, and the Greek Literary Tradition at Rome	9
IV. Greek Literature and Flavian Rome	13
V. Uncovering the Greeks in Martial's <i>Epigrams</i>	16
CHAPTER ONE: NEITHER 'US' NOR 'THEM': MARTIAL ON THE GREEKS	18
I. Martial the Bilingual: Greek Language in the <i>Epigrams</i>	24
II. Martial the Critic: Greek Literature and Art in the <i>Epigrams</i>	44
III. Martial the Bard: Homeric Epic in the <i>Epigrams</i>	63
IV. Conclusion	85
CHAPTER TWO: FROM STONE TO PAGE: MARTIAL AND INSCRIBED EPIGRAM	87
I. Martial and Sepulchral Epigram	90
II. Martial and Dedicatory Epigram	102
III. Martial and Epideictic Epigram	115
IV. Conclusion	126
CHAPTER THREE: HELLENISTIC LOVE IN FLAVIAN ROME: MARTIAL AND EROTIC EPIGRAM	128
I. Martial's Asclepiades	131
II. Martial's Posidippus	141
III. Martial's Callimachus	147
IV. Martial's Meleager	158
V. Conclusion	171

CHAPTER FOUR: MAKING MOCKERY MINE: MARTIAL AND SKOPTIC EPIGRAM	174
I. Martial and the Themes of Skoptic Epigram	178
II. Martial and the Mockery of Professions.....	180
III. Martial and the Mockery of Physical Qualities	195
IV. Martial and the Mockery of Moral Qualities	207
V. Conclusion.....	218
 CONCLUSION	 221
BIBLIOGRAPHY	224

INTRODUCTION

Quid te vana iuvant miserae ludibria chartae?
 hoc lege, quod possit dicere vita 'meum est.'
 non hic Centauros, non Gorgonas Harpyiasque
 invenies: hominem pagina nostra sapit.
 sed non vis, Mamurra, tuos cognoscere mores
 nec te scire: legas Aetia Callimachi.
 (Martial, *Ep.* 10.4.7-12)

What good does the empty nonsense of these wretched pages [= mythological poems] do you? Read *this* instead – real life can say 'it's all mine.' You won't find Centaurs here, or Gorgons, or Harpies: my page tastes of humanity. But if you don't want to recognize your own behavior, Mamurra, or to know thyself, you should read the *Aetia* of Callimachus.

This programmatic poem from Book 10 of Martial's *Epigrams* marks one of only two occasions on which the Roman poet explicitly names a writer of Greek epigram.¹ Even here, Martial evokes Callimachus not as an epigrammatist but as author of the *Aetia*, and his portrayal is hardly flattering. Martial seeks to establish himself as a paragon of realistic, useful poetry, and rejects swollen mythological themes as represented, ironically enough, by the champion of λεπτότης. But a reader of this poem would surely recall that Callimachus himself wrote epigrams, in the process avoiding the same myths with which Martial accuses him of consorting here. The picture we get of Callimachus, then, is two-sided: on the one hand, the *Aetia*'s lack of regard for *vita* stands diametrically opposed to Martial's professed epigrammatic goals, but on the other, Callimachus is a fundamentally important representative of the very epigrammatic tradition to which Martial belongs, whether he likes it or not. As we will soon see, it is this latent tension that invariably characterizes Martial's relationship with his Greek predecessors and produces within his work a sort of 'identity crisis': to what extent is Martial's status as an epigrammatist

¹ The other, also Callimachus, is at *Ep.* 4.23.

defined by the Greek tradition, and how does this problematize or otherwise qualify his frequent self-identification as an author of purebred *Latin* epigram?

The present study aims to answer – or start answering – this question, but wherever the textual evidence may lead, it is indisputable that Martial occupies a dominant position in the history of ancient epigram. He seems to have dedicated his career to epigrammatic poetry, and in terms of surviving output, he far surpasses any individual predecessor.² Stylistically, Martial embodies what modern readers consider the fundamental characteristics of epigram – brevity, wit, sporadic moralism – and these assumptions reflect his tremendous creative reception by later authors.³ In Martial's looming presence it is easy to forget that he belongs to a long tradition of epigram, literary and inscribed, Latin and Greek. This is not to say, of course, that he makes no acknowledgment of his participation in such a tradition. Indeed, as early as the preface to his first book, he invokes the authority of such Latin epigrammatists as Catullus, Domitius Marsus, and Albinovanus Pedo by way of defending his project against its potential critics.⁴ References to these and other Roman poets are liberally scattered throughout the rest of his work. More perplexing, however, is Martial's treatment of his Greek predecessors, who by comparison with their Latin counterparts play a much more muted role in the *Epigrams*. There are surprisingly few overt references to any Greek poets at all in

² It is perhaps surprising that an author would restrict himself to an occasional genre like epigram, but that does seem to be the case with Martial. If we believe the poet himself, he dislikes the impracticality of mythological or epic themes in favor of the everyday usefulness of more realistic topics – and his own subsequent popularity (on which see Chapter 1). This philosophy was probably influenced by Martial's continued success, or else he would have moved on to more profitable endeavors. Rimell (2009: 14) expresses deep interest in the question of why Martial apparently wrote only epigram, although her work does not contain a systematic treatment of the issue.

³ A striking example is Johannes Burmeister, a seventeenth-century German who parodied the entirety of the *Epigrams* by transforming them into poems about Christianity (cf. Sullivan 1991: 281-2; Fitzgerald 2007: 190ff.).

⁴ Mart. 1.praef.: *sic scribit Catullus, sic Marsus, sic Pedo, sic Gaetulicus, sic quicumque perlegitur* (this and all subsequent Martial texts are from Shackleton Bailey's 1990 edition)

Martial's corpus,⁵ and these pale in comparison to the frequent appearances of Latin authors like Catullus, Vergil, Horace, Ovid, and Lucan, not to mention Martial's various Roman contemporaries. If we search for citation of Greek epigrammatists in particular, the search will be a long one, as Martial passes them over in near-complete silence.⁶

This dissertation will attempt to explain the silence. Using three subgenres as case studies, I will argue that Greek epigram from the archaic to the imperial period is very much present in Martial's oeuvre, to an extent heretofore unrecognized or otherwise discounted. Through careful comparative analysis I will demonstrate some remarkable inconsistencies in Martial's treatment of Greek material, and these inconsistencies will in turn reveal a fundamental ambivalence with which Martial, like any Roman author writing in a genre with a Greek past, must contend – he must negotiate the inevitable and irreconcilable tension between acknowledging the importance of his Greek predecessors and asserting his own claim to superiority over them. I will suggest that Martial's suppression of the Greeks is willful; it in part contributes to his invention of a purely Roman epigrammatic tradition over which he himself reigns, and in part offers a playful challenge to his educated audience to hunt for allusions in much the same way as I am doing here.⁷ In essence, Martial exploits the Greek tradition and the tensions surrounding it for simultaneously self-fashioning and satirical purposes, and while I will argue that such a response is unique to Martial, I hope that this study will also encourage scholars to

⁵ By my count, Homer appears three times, Menander, Callimachus, and Sappho twice each, and Pindar once.

⁶ The sole exceptions are poem 4.23, in which the poet favorably compares Bruttianus, an otherwise unknown contemporary Greek epigrammatist, to Callimachus, and 10.4, discussed above, although the latter does not treat Callimachus as a writer of epigram.

⁷ Cf. Nisbet (2007b) 355: "[Martial's] ham-fisted attempts at faking up a ring-fenced Latin literary pedigree are red flags to a genre-aware readership – I would argue, by design."

rethink the ways in which other Roman authors engage with their precursors, Greek and Latin alike.

I. Martialian Scholarship

Martial's marginal status as an author of poetry, often very obscene poetry, in a "low" genre long made him an unappealing subject for modern classical scholarship.⁸

Exceptions existed, of course, notably Friedländer's late nineteenth-century commentary on the entire *Epigrams*,⁹ a feat which has not been duplicated since, and specialized commentaries on Books I and XI published in the 1970's and 80's.¹⁰ Between Friedländer and these single-book commentaries, monographs and articles emerged in fits and starts, the majority of which focused on Martial's relationship with Domitian, and his position as a Flavian author more broadly.¹¹ Martialian scholarship underwent a renaissance for an English-speaking audience with J.P. Sullivan's seminal 1991 book, *Martial: The Unexpected Classic*, a sweeping literary-historical overview and even rehabilitation of the author and his poems. While Sullivan's treatment of individual topics was necessarily broad, his work opened new avenues of inquiry for future scholars, who rose to the occasion: since Sullivan's monograph, individual commentaries on all books of Martial except Book XII have been published,¹² valuable book-length studies

⁸ By "modern" I mean post-eighteenth century. Martial was well read before then, although in ways not entirely consonant with the aims of classical scholarship today.

⁹ Friedländer (1881).

¹⁰ Book I: Citroni (1975) (also his own edition), Howell (1980); Book XI: Kay (1985).

¹¹ E.g. Helles (1906) *The Epigram and its Greatest Master, Martial*; Helm (1928) *Studien zu Martial*; Siedschlag (1977) *Zur Form von Martials Epigrammen*. Best (1969), Szelest (1974); cf. also Garthwaite (1990).

¹² See my bibliography for a complete list. An unpublished commentary on Book XII remains Bowie (1988).

have come thick on the ground,¹³ and articles have been written on a wide range of subjects.¹⁴

Work on Martial's intertextual relationship with his Roman predecessors, Catullus and Ovid in particular, has proven especially fruitful.¹⁵ In recent years excellent cases have been made for the ways in which Martial tends to cut earlier Roman poets down to size (or "banalize" them, to use Fitzgerald's term),¹⁶ a phenomenon that I consider to be unquestionably at play in his treatment of Greek poetry as well. There has been very little scholarship, however, on Martial and the Greek epigrammatic tradition, before or since Sullivan. Sullivan himself gives a very general summary of the topic, devoting cursory attention to inscribed and Hellenistic epigram, and slightly more to imperial Greek epigram, although close analysis and interpretation are lacking.¹⁷ Fitzgerald has an "excursus" on Martial and Greek epigram, containing some keen insights about the prominence of the genre, formally and informally, in Martial's Rome, but again the section is too brief to make any major contributions to the question.¹⁸ Holzberg is somewhat more thoroughgoing; his 2002 monograph makes a start of considering Martial's relationship to Hellenistic epigram, and his hesitant suggestion that Martial may have modeled the structure of his books upon Hellenistic epigram books is an important one.¹⁹ He devotes a separate section to Martial and the Neronian epigrammatist Lucillius,

¹³ Holzberg (2002), Lorenz (2002), Hennig (2003), Fitzgerald (2007), Spisak (2007), Rimell (2009).

¹⁴ E.g. genre: Citroni (2003); poetics: Johnson (2005); book structure: Fowler (1995), Roman (2001); intertextuality (on which see below).

¹⁵ Overview: Sullivan (1991) 93-114; Catullus: Swann (1994), Fitzgerald (2007) 167-86, Fain (2008), Lorenz (2010); Ovid: Pitcher (1998), Szelest (1999), Williams (2002a), Fitzgerald (2007) 186-90, Hinds (2007).

¹⁶ See esp. Fitzgerald (2007) 167-86, Hinds (2007), Lorenz (2010).

¹⁷ Sullivan (1991) 78-93. There is also a useful index of Greek analogues to Martial's epigrams at Sullivan (1991) 322-7.

¹⁸ Fitzgerald (2007) 25-33.

¹⁹ Holzberg (2002) 23-9.

borrowing heavily from Burnikel's 1980 book on Martial's formal and stylistic debts to that poet.²⁰ Holzberg's contributions are valuable, but unfortunately they are made in passing and are easily lost within the complex web of generic issues underlying his overall argument. A recent essay by Margot Neger shares perhaps the closest affinity to the goals of this study; we have drawn some of the same conclusions using similar methodologies, but an article-length work, important though it may be, can naturally only scratch the surface of so complex a topic. She argues, as I will in greater depth, that Martial's allusions to his Greek predecessors both call attention to the literary tradition to which he belongs and serve as foils against which he can establish his own reputation as an epigrammatist.²¹

It should be evident from this overview that, despite the proliferation of Martialian scholarship over the past twenty years, there remain significant gaps in our understanding of how precisely Martial engages with the Greek epigrammatic tradition. Little has been said about the presence in the *Epigrams* of archaic and classical (inscribed) or Hellenistic (literary) epigram. Imperial Greek epigram has received more consideration through the figure of Lucillius, but to the neglect of his successor Nicarchus, who is, I would argue, no less important an influence on Martial's work. My aim, then, is to fill these gaps with something that has been missing until now: a systematic literary analysis of Martial's relationship with his Greek predecessors.

This analysis will be grounded in close readings of Martial's epigrams, frequently alongside Greek epigrams and other poems with which I see him participating in an

²⁰ Holzberg (2002) 100-9; Burnikel (1980); cf. also Laurens (1965) and Nisbet (2007b).

²¹ Neger (2014).

intertextual relationship. My earlier claim that Martial's allusions reflect both a self-fashioning intent (to the extent that authorial intent can be reconstructed at all) and an ironic acknowledgement of an unstable poetic relationship with the Greek literary past obviously owes much to Hinds' *Allusion and Intertext* and the theories of poetic appropriation it espouses.²² I will likewise follow Hinds from time to time by suggesting that Martial encourages his readers to reconsider the text to which he is alluding from a "Martalian" perspective.²³ In his second chapter, Hinds also offers a useful approach to a challenge that my study will inevitably face: how to tell the difference between an allusion and a *topos*. His blurring of the distinction between a *modello-esemplare* and a *modello-codice*, as Conte describes them, goes a long way toward justifying the weight I must necessarily give to Martial's treatment of epigrammatic *topoi*, especially in the case of the early Greek material, where specific textual imitation is difficult to find.²⁴

II. Epigram as Genre

But what, exactly, *is* an epigram? The definition of the genre is as fluid as its content. At the most literal level, an ἐπίγραμμα is merely something written on something else, an inscription, and we will find in my next chapter that such a definition is not without value.²⁵ But obviously by Martial's time, epigram was much more than that – it had long since been transformed by authors of the Hellenistic period into a literary genre.²⁶

The reasons for this transformation are difficult to discern, but the growing popularity of

²² Hinds (1998), esp. ch.5 and 142-4 in particular.

²³ Hinds (1998) 99-122.

²⁴ Hinds (1998) 34-47.

²⁵ *LSJ* s.v. ἐπίγραμμα.

²⁶ Although interestingly no poet describes his work as an ἐπίγραμμα until the imperial period. Cf. Puelma (1996) 125.

collections of transcribed physical epigrams probably played a role, as a sort of literary recontextualization which might have inspired poets to innovate.²⁷ Likewise, the status of epigram as a ‘marginalized’ – or rather nonexistent – genre might have encouraged Hellenistic authors to thrust it into the limelight as they did with other untitled genres like hymn and bucolic.²⁸ Whatever the reasons, epigram did become popular in the Hellenistic period, and the diverse output of Hellenistic poets informed their successors, Greek and Latin alike, in countless ways, as this study will address.²⁹ Greek authors, such as Meleager and Philip, assembled impressive ‘garlands’ of Greek epigrams, which continued to be written through the imperial period and beyond. Latin poets were no less prolific: members of the circle of Lutatius Catulus adapted Greek love epigram for a Roman context, and Catullus took the genre in new directions, most remarkably toward invective and obscenity. Marsus, Lentulus Gaeticulus, and Pedo all contributed to the development of epigram, but for lack of evidence their influence cannot be measured apart from the occasional mention in Martial’s *Epigrams*.³⁰ Martial himself emerges rather late in the game, and as alluded to above, many readers, effectively buying into Martial’s own rhetoric, view his work as the culmination of the genre.

In the face of such constant evolution, it is challenging to develop a synchronic definition of epigram as a genre, especially given that Martial’s poems have come to represent epigram *par excellence*. Even so, some general characteristics can be observed, with all necessary qualifications. Structurally, epigrams are poems and tend on the short

²⁷ Reitzenstein (1907). An example is Philochorus’ *Epigramma Attika*. Cf. Bing and Bruss (2007) 6, n. 26.

²⁸ Bing and Bruss (2007) 7.

²⁹ A good overview is Livingstone and Nisbet (2010).

³⁰ Added to this list may be Seneca the Younger (should his epigrams be authentic) and the author(s) of the *Carmina Priapeia*.

side, an echo of the spatial constraints imposed upon them as actual inscriptions.³¹ They are usually more pointed than other poems, which probably reflects their authors' attempts to say as much as possible in a brief number of verses. In Martial's case, as with various earlier epigrammatists, this pointedness manifests as wit, often concentrated in a punchline at the end of the poem.³² Thematically, attempts to generalize about epigram are ill-advised in light of the incredible variety of surviving topics, even within Martial's corpus alone. Rather, we might describe epigram as an occasional genre; its poems are written (in reality or fictively) for a specific occasion or event, and are consequently embedded in a particular social context, much as inscribed epigrams are bound to their physical context. This social context, however, may be a carefully-fashioned fictional construct, as recent scholars have convincingly argued in the case of Martial.³³ Questions of context will remain crucially important over the course of this study insofar as Martial's 'Greece' and 'Rome' are two very different concepts, serving very different functions within the *Epigrams*.

III. Martial, Latin Epigram, and the Greek Literary Tradition at Rome

This project, with its near-exclusive focus on the Greeks, will no doubt be met with the question of where and how Martial's Roman (or rather Latin-writing) predecessors factor into his reception of Greek sources. Indeed, it would be perverse to suggest that Martial's intertextual relationship with earlier Latin poets is not a fundamental component of his own poetic agenda and his perception of the Greek past, and in a longer study I could

³¹ This is not to say they have a maximum length, as Martial reminds his readers in *Ep.* 6.63.

³² The witty punchline is not, however, a Martialian innovation, and owes much to his near-contemporary Lucilius, on whom see Chapter 4.

³³ E.g. Fitzgerald (2007); Rimmel (2009).

make a fuller account of how Martial deals with the Roman epigrammatic and more broadly poetic tradition.³⁴ The scope of my current project, however, limits the amount of attention I can devote to Latin material, and while I am highly conscious of the potential for Catullan, Vergilian, Ovidian, and other allusions in my chosen poems,³⁵ my scrutiny of these allusions by necessity cannot be exhaustive. That said, a few broad remarks about the role played by Latin epigram in Martial's work can provide some useful background against which to evaluate his engagement with the Greek tradition.

Catullus, as a famous author of Latin epigram, is the gold standard against whom Martial (overtly, at least) measures himself from the earliest phase of his career. Catullus appears explicitly more than a dozen times throughout the *Epigrams* and is usually invoked with great reverence on Martial's part.³⁶ Catullus' implicit presence is more pervasive still, and Martial's creative adaptation and transformation of his predecessor's poems has warranted no shortage of scholarly attention.³⁷ Fitzgerald notices Martial's tendency to expose the intimate moments of Catullan poetry (both polymetra and epigrams) to the wider – and often uglier – world of city life, moving from the urbane to the urban. Catullus and Lesbia's famed kisses, for instance, become in Martial's hands the grotesque salutations of the unwashed mob (*Ep.* 12.59) or are likened to the crowd's innumerable cheers for the emperor at the games (6.34).³⁸ Sven Lorenz suggests that Martial compares himself to Catullus in order to explicate or intensify and ultimately surpass him, as when he makes it clear what Catullus' *passer* 'really' meant (7.14 and

³⁴ It is fortuitous that Mindt (2013) has quite lately done much of the work from the Latin side of things.

³⁵ The wide range of excellent scholarship on Martalian intertextuality, discussed above, has proven that the failure to attend to possible Latin intertexts would be irresponsible on my part.

³⁶ E.g. *Ep.* 10.78.16: *uno sed tibi sim minor Catullo* ("but for you may I be less than Catullus alone").

³⁷ For an overview, see Sullivan (1991) 95-7.

³⁸ Fitzgerald (2007) 170-81.

esp. 11.6).³⁹ These forms of poetic appropriation – urban “banalization” (Fitzgerald) and redefinition (Lorenz) – are both key components of Martial’s relationship with his Greek epigrammatic predecessors as well, as we will see in the coming chapters.

Less apparent in the *Epigrams*, but no less relevant, and in that sense more like the Greek epigrammatists, are later sources of Latin epigram, whom Martial mentions only a handful of times.⁴⁰ In the case of shadowy figures like Marsus, Gaeticulus, and Pedo, little can be said short of acknowledging Martialian features in extant fragments, which survive only for Marsus.⁴¹ The epigrams of the *Priapeia*, meanwhile, bear some striking similarities to those of Martial, and regardless of whether they were composed before or shortly after the *Epigrams*, looking at them alongside Martial’s Priapic poems, several of which I will discuss in my first two chapters, is always rewarding. Very broadly speaking, scholars have found that Martial’s Priapic poems tend to play on the comic potential of Priapus-as-guardian (as at *Ep.* 6.16) and, unlike those of the *CP*, often avoid primary obscenities in favor of thinly-veiled euphemism (as at 6.49, discussed in Chapter 2) – O’Connor goes so far as to suggest that Martial was intentionally trying to distance himself from the notoriety of the widely-circulated *CP*.⁴²

In order to provide a broader framework for my argument, I must also take into account the various ways in which earlier Roman authors translate, adapt, or otherwise appropriate their own Greek sources. Obviously many studies could be (and have been) written on such a fertile subject, but for my present purposes it will suffice to provide a

³⁹ Lorenz (2010).

⁴⁰ Vergil: *Ep.* ; Ovid: *Ep.* 1.61, 3.38, 5.10, 12.44, 14.192.

⁴¹ Cf. Sullivan (1991) 97-100.

⁴² Cf. Willenberg (1973); Sullivan (1991) 108-10; Richlin (1992) 116-41 (also 141-3 on dating the collection); O’Connor (1998), esp. 189; Elomaa (2015).

general overview of the topic.⁴³ Latin translations – and I use the term loosely – of Greek originals survive from the earliest period of Latin literature with Livius Andronicus’ *Odusia* and persist through New Comedy-inspired playwrights Plautus and Terence, Catullus, who translates Sappho (Cat. 51) and Callimachus (Cat. 66), and Cicero, with his rendering of Aratus’ *Phaenomena*, right up to Martial himself (*Ep.* 6.19, a near-translation of Lucilius, on which see Chapter 4).⁴⁴ As we move into the realm of Latin ‘allusion to’ or ‘engagement with’ Greek literature, the field grows even more expansive, and while I cannot adequately summarize here such a broad phenomenon, an awareness of how authors from Cicero to Catullus to Vergil deal with the Greek literary tradition within their respective genres will remain necessary as a potential source of intertextual approaches against which to evaluate Martial’s own.⁴⁵ As for Latin engagement with Greek epigram in particular, valuable work has been done recently on Hellenistic epigram and Roman elegy, increasing our understanding of how authors like Tibullus, Propertius, and Ovid have inherited the self-conscious exploitation by Hellenistic epigrammatists of the “thematic, generic and intertextual versatility of their form.”⁴⁶ The influence of Greek epigram on Catullus has also received attention by scholars who have explored his versatile handling of the Hellenistic ‘poetry of objects’ and his careful allusion to select

⁴³ A good sampling of work can be found in Glucker and Burnett (2012). For more specific areas, see the following notes. In Chapter 1, I will consider more fully the ways in which Latin authors other than Martial incorporate the Greek language into their writing.

⁴⁴ Cf. Possanza (2004) 46-62. The distinction between a translation and an adaptation can be slight, and for that reason I do not restrict my definition of ‘translation’ here to mechanical word-for-word rendering.

⁴⁵ For Cicero as ‘Greek’ orator, cf. e.g. Wooten (1977) “Cicero’s reactions to Demosthenes: a clarification” *CJ* 73: 37-43; for Cicero (and Germanicus!) as ‘Greek’ poet, cf. Possanza (2004) *Translating the Heavens: Aratus, Germanicus, and the Poetics of Latin Translation*. New York; for Cicero as scholar, cf. Bishop (2011); on Catullus and Greek epigram, cf. e.g. Hutchinson (2003), Gutzwiller (2012), Nelis (2012); the bibliography on Vergil and Greek epic is too large to summarize here.

⁴⁶ Keith (2012).

epigrams of Meleager, both as a poet and anthologist, a phenomenon that we will encounter with Martial in my third chapter.⁴⁷

IV. Greek Literature and Flavian Rome

It is important as well to recall Martial's Flavian literary context and to consider whether contemporary Roman poets writing in other genres – namely Statius, Valerius Flaccus, and Silius Italicus (a revered figure in Martial's *Epigrams*) – might reflect current trends in adapting Greek sources.⁴⁸ Statius, given his Greco-Neapolitan descent,⁴⁹ would seem an especially likely participant in the Greek literary tradition, and indeed recent scholarship has explored his rich engagement with a variety of Greek genres. Particular consideration has been given to how Statius incorporates Homeric, lyric, and other Greek intertexts into the *Silvae* and *Achilleid* as a way to bridge the gap between the epic and occasional genres in which he writes.⁵⁰ Important as well has been the study of the role played by Greek tragedy in the *Thebaid*, and we find that Statius transforms and adapts tragic motifs for the imperial Roman context of his work in much the same way as Martial (I will argue) transforms Greek epigram into something more appropriate to a very different Roman epigrammatic world.⁵¹

Valerius Flaccus works even more directly with a Greek model, Apollonius, in his *Argonautica*. Scholars have understandably devoted a great deal of attention to the

⁴⁷ Hutchinson (2003); Gutzwiller (2012). On common ground between Greek and Latin epigram more generally, see Höschele (2010).

⁴⁸ Many of the articles in Nauta et al. (eds.) (2006) address this question in some form. Augoustakis (ed.) (2014) addresses Flavian engagement with Greek literature on an author-by-author basis.

⁴⁹ As mentioned in the *Silvae*. See *NP* s.v. Statius, P. Papinius.

⁵⁰ Fantham (2011); Bessone (2014); see also Sfyroeras (2014) for a more focused reading of Statius' fractured deployment of an Iliadic simile in the *Achilleid*.

⁵¹ On the *Thebaid* and Greek tragedy, see Hulls (2014); Soerink (2014); Marinis (2015).

complex relationship between the Apollonian and Valerian versions of the story, often as filtered through Homeric, Vergilian, and Ovidian lenses.⁵² Valerius' use of other Greek genres has been explored to a lesser degree, but especially noteworthy here is Dinter's observation of a Valerian "poetics of epigram": certain scenes from the *Argonautica*, he argues, allude to themes from Greek and Roman sepulchral and dedicatory epigram, and Valerius often describes dead or doomed characters using "epitaphic gestures" (such as the phrase *te quoque*), which serve both as structural markers and as sentimental gestures toward a bygone golden era.⁵³

The fiercely Roman theme of Silius Italicus' *Punica* seems to have discouraged comparison with Greek antecedents, especially in light of more obvious Vergilian intertexts.⁵⁴ But Augoustakis' recent collection has brought the issue to the fore, and interesting arguments have been made about the presence in the *Punica* not only of Homeric epic, but also of Pindaric epinikia and even Greek political philosophy.⁵⁵ Martial's own take on Silius, whom he addresses as a patron in several epigrams, is rather more self-serving, but still informative. He describes Silius not just as a Roman (literary) champion (4.14.2-3 *qui periuria barbari furoris / ingenti premis ore*, "you who crush with massive mouth the injustices of barbarian madness"), but as *Castalidum decus sororum* ("glory of the Castalian sisters"), an epithet with a surprising Greek component.⁵⁶ Martial concludes this same poem by openly comparing Silius to Vergil (13-4): *sic forsan tener ausus est Catullus / magno mittere Passerem Maroni* ("perhaps in

⁵² A few recent studies are Davis (2009); Leigh (2010); Finkmann (2014); Krasne (2014); van der Schuur (2014); Seal (2014).

⁵³ Dinter (2009).

⁵⁴ Two notable exceptions are Juhnke (1972) and Ripoll (2001).

⁵⁵ Homer: Karakasis (2014), van der Keur (2014); Pindar: Littlewood (2014); philosophy: Fucecchi (2014).

⁵⁶ Cf. Soldevila (2006) 178-9. It is tempting to take this poem and its inflated epic language as a playful mockery of Silius' chosen genre, if not Silius himself.

the same way did tender Catullus venture to give his *Passer* to great Maro”). This comparison clearly benefits Martial, who occupies the role of Catullus, no less than Silius, and for all his deference Martial does not in the end come off as Silius’ poetic inferior.⁵⁷ These sorts of interactions and comments, found throughout the *Epigrams*, raise important questions about how Martial deals with the apparent generic disparities between epic and epigram, questions which should not be limited to Latin literature, as I hope to demonstrate in my first chapter with my analysis of Martial’s relationship with Homer.

I must also keep in mind the related question of whether the Greek context to which Martial’s epigrams react is the reflection of a Flavian literary and cultural milieu or a fictional construct unique to Martial. It is probable, in my opinion, that Martial’s ‘Rome’ is just such a construct, but the question is more vexed for the Greeks given the dearth of explicit references to them (past or present) in the *Epigrams*. Even so, I suspect that Martial has intentionally fashioned a bipolar ‘Greece,’ an uneasy hybrid of past literary/artistic accomplishment and present decline from that accomplishment.⁵⁸ This is not to say that Greek past and Greek present are uniformly ‘good’ and ‘bad’ in Martial’s poems – there are plenty of exceptions to such a generalization, as my first chapter will make apparent – but rather that Martial depicts a Greece perpetually at odds with itself.⁵⁹ This internal disagreement in turn provides a reasonable backdrop for the tension experienced by Martial as a Latin author engaging with the Greeks, past and present.

⁵⁷ Soldevila (2006) 177.

⁵⁸ It is probably no coincidence that the majority of Greek names in the *Epigrams* belong to prostitutes.

⁵⁹ The contradictions are perhaps easiest to spot between past and present, as I have described, but they exist without crossing temporal boundaries as well. For example, the contemporary Greek prostitutes above are offset by the cultured Greek poet Bruttianus (4.23) and the literary critic Apollinaris (4.86, 7.26).

V. Uncovering the Greeks in Martial's *Epigrams*

In the coming chapters I hope to develop a comprehensive understanding of Martial's intentionally ambivalent engagement with Greek epigram. Chapter 1 will set the stage by examining what Martial himself has to say about Greek language, art, and literature, namely his studied inconsistencies as regards the 'appropriate' use of Greek in otherwise Latin contexts, rivalries between Greek and Roman sculptors and architects, and the relationship between epigram and epic, as represented by Homer. We will find throughout all books of the *Epigrams* a playful exploitation of the tension between Greek and Roman cultural identity, and this will provide us with some valuable context against which to evaluate Martial's treatment of the Greek epigrammatic tradition more specifically.

This evaluation will begin in Chapter 2 with a look at those of Martial's poems which fashion themselves as the earliest form of epigram, inscription: epitaphs for favorite slaves, votive offerings to Domitian, ekphrases on various works of art, and the like. More precisely, I will consider how these faux-inscriptions simultaneously borrow from and invert the language and themes of Greek (archaic, classical, and especially Hellenistic) sepulchral, dedicatory, and epideictic epigram, both physical and literary. Martial's playfully irreverent treatment of Greek inscriptional tropes will demonstrate their formative role in his poetry, but also their dissonance with the world of Roman epigram which he has created.

In Chapter 3, I will turn to the uniquely poetic phenomenon of erotic epigram and explore Martial's relationship with individual authors from the Greek Anthology, from the subgenre's ostensible founder Asclepiades of Samos to the famed anthologist

Meleager of Gadara. My analysis will reveal just how much Martial owes to these Greek authors, filtered though they may be through the Latin amatory tradition, and, more strikingly, how often he quietly one-ups these same predecessors by implying, as he does with inscriptional epigram, that their erotic epigrams are far from a perfect fit for his Roman epigrammatic world.

Finally, Chapter 4 will study Martial's commonly observed engagement with skoptic epigram, an invective subgenre popularized by imperial Greek poets like Lucillius and Nicarchus. I will discuss not only Martial's extensive stylistic debt to these authors, Lucillius in particular, but also a number of thematic parallels which appear in the form of common skoptic targets, whether notorious professionals like doctors and lawyers, the physically unappealing, or the morally degenerate. My analysis will demonstrate, beyond Martial's frequent borrowings from and allusions to the Greek skoptic epigrammatists, his subtle but persistent intertextual efforts to simultaneously suppress and surpass them.

These four chapters will as a whole present a well-rounded overview of the many ways in which Martial imagines for his audience a bipolar Greek epigrammatic tradition, deftly balancing himself between the two poles: at times he respectfully embraces his participation in the rich and varied history of Greek epigram, and at times he irreverently attempts to invert, subvert, or erase this history altogether, all for the entertainment of his well-educated readers, for whom his engagement with the Greek tradition would no doubt have been hidden in plain sight.

CHAPTER ONE: NEITHER 'US' NOR 'THEM': MARTIAL ON THE GREEKS

Those who search for a unified message in Martial's collection of epigrams will frequently have their efforts frustrated by clear – sometimes glaring – contradictions between individual poems. This fact need not demoralize the critical reader, however, since discontinuity can be no less effective a tool for making meaning than unity. Nowhere is this clearer than in Martial's depiction of Greece, and over the course of the *Epigrams*, he paints a picture of Greek influence on the imperial Roman world as a fundamentally and irreconcilably bipolar phenomenon. The current chapter will examine this portrayal of the Greeks along two axes, the linguistic and the artistic. I will first consider how Martial's fluent use of the Greek language throughout the *Epigrams*, most frequently as a focus of humor, calls attention to a culture simultaneously embedded in and alienated from everyday Roman life. I will then turn to Martial's observations on the Greek sculptural and poetic tradition, which taken as a whole present a consistently inconsistent commentary on the uneasy coexistence of Greek and Roman arts. Finally, I will hone in on one particular aspect of this artistic commentary: Martial's irreverent and transformative appropriation of Homeric epic, which are suggestive of a possible self-fashioning agenda behind the poet's ambivalent treatment of the Greeks.

While a systematic analysis of the Greeks' explicit presence in the *Epigrams* has not yet been performed, scholars have on occasion noticed relationships between Martial's audience and a diverse array of analogous 'others.' J.P. Sullivan calls attention to several such groups – slaves and freedmen, skilled laborers, the ugly or deformed, women – and suggests that Martial has mockingly assumed the role of social arbiter, lampooning the

ways in which these groups deviate from the norm.⁶⁰ Lindsay and Patricia Watson offer textual analysis of individual poems, juxtaposing epigrams on similar themes, including ‘others’ like women and sexual deviants, but they do not present a synthetic overview of any one group.⁶¹ Neither Sullivan nor Watson and Watson seem to suggest that Martial’s attitude toward these groups is anything but polemical. William Fitzgerald is more receptive to possible ambiguities; he suggests, for example, that Martial appoints himself gatekeeper in charge of determining which topics gain admission to his book,⁶² an insight which reminds us how selective Martial might have been in his depictions of foreignized groups (like the Greeks). Fitzgerald argues further that Martial’s frequent juxtaposition of the behavior of slaves – an omnipresent ‘other’ in Roman society – with that of free men and even the emperor, expresses the poet’s keen awareness of just how tenuous the long-established boundaries between such social groups really are.⁶³

This question of the extent to which Martial’s ‘others’ are truly ‘other’ is the driving force behind this chapter. Has the pervasive influence of Greek culture and literature resulted in its total assimilation into Roman society as perceived (or constructed) by Martial? Or does Martial’s Greece remain a foreign entity? Roman authors struggled with this paradox long before Martial, as Horace’s oft-quoted observation – *Graecia capta ferum victorem cepit* (“Greece, though conquered, conquered her savage victor,” Hor. *Ep.* 2.1.156) – makes pithily apparent.⁶⁴ Indeed, for Romans from the late republic

⁶⁰ Sullivan (1991), 162-70, 185-210.

⁶¹ Watson and Watson (2003).

⁶² Fitzgerald (2007), 77-80. Fitzgerald is referring here to historical exemplars in particular.

⁶³ Fitzgerald (2007), 123-31.

⁶⁴ Wallace-Hadrill (2008) 237-9 develops the irony further by suggesting that Roman conquest of the Greeks understandably compelled the conquered people to take comfort in their “glorious past,” and that this in turn encouraged Romans to take similar pride in their own *maiores*. The result, he argues, was to detach definitions of ‘the Greek’ and ‘the Roman’ from contemporary reality. Martial, the self-professed chronicler of real life (for more on

onward, Rome's appropriation of Greek culture functioned simultaneously as an assertion of its dominance – physical and cultural – over Greece and as a stimulus for the belief that an education in all things Greek was a necessary prerequisite for Romans with “aspirations to refinement,” whether social or literary.⁶⁵ After all, the people of Rome were not barbarians, but neither were they Greeks.

This chapter will argue that, rather than trying to resolve these paradoxes, Martial embraces them as self-fashioning and comic devices, and that as a consequence of his intentional ambivalence Greece occupies a peculiarly liminal role in the *Epigrams* – the Greeks are neither ‘us’ nor ‘them.’ As stated above, I will focus primarily on two areas – linguistic and artistic – within which Martial's ambivalence is most clearly visible, but the range of his ambiguous engagement with Greek culture is by no means limited to these two: Martial's treatments of Greek social status (especially *hetairai* and slaves), philosophy, geography, and even wildlife (he is particularly fond of Attic bees) all invite arguments similar to the ones I will make in the coming pages.⁶⁶ It is important to realize that at any given moment Martial may be engaging simultaneously with any of these areas in addition to the ones I will be discussing in greater detail – his relationship with the Greeks is never simple.

A poem from the tenth book offers a representative example of how Martial can exploit the tension between a Roman and a foreign Greece on multiple levels at once (*Ep.* 10.68):

which see below), would surely have been very sensitive to the gaps, discrepancies, and tensions produced by a Roman present which bases its identity on a Greek and Roman past.

⁶⁵ Edwards and Woolf (2003), 15. See also Wallace-Hadrill (1998), a useful overview of Roman-Greek code-switching as a means of negotiating this very tension.

⁶⁶ On social status: e.g. 5.11, 6.71, 7.80; on philosophy: 9.47, 10.33; on geography: e.g. Sp.3, 4.55, 13.106; on bees and honey: 5.67, 11.42, 13.104-6, 108.

Cum tibi non Ephesos nec sit Rhodos aut Mitylene,
 sed domus in vico, Laelia, patricio,
 deque coloratis numquam lita mater Etruscis,
 durus Aricina de regione pater;
 κύριέ μου, μέλι μου, ψυχὴ μου congeris usque,
 pro pudor! Hersiliae civis et Egeriae.
 lectulus has voces, nec lectulus audiat omnis,
 sed quem lascivo stravit amica viro.
 scire cupis quo casta modo matrona loquaris?
 numquid, quae crisat, blandior esse potest?
 tu licet ediscas totam referasque Corinthon,
 non tamen omnino, Laelia, Lais eris.⁶⁷

Even though your home isn't in Ephesus or Rhodes or Mitylene, Laelia, but on Patrician Avenue; even though your mother descended from the ruddy Etruscans (*she* never wore makeup) and your stern father came from the neighborhood of Aricia, still you ceaselessly pile it on: *mon chéri! mon mignon! mon cœur!* For shame! And you're from the same place as Hersilia and Egeria.⁶⁸ Leave that talk for the bedroom – and not just any bedroom, but one that a lover has prepped for her lustful man. Do you want to know how you're talking, virtuous matron that you are? A woman wouldn't be any more seductive if she were actively gyrating. But you can study and reproduce the whole of Corinth all you want, Laelia, you'll never be completely Lais.

On its most basic level, the epigram is mocking Laelia, a pedigreed Roman matron, for attempting to be something she is not, namely a Greek *hetaira*. This mockery culminates in the concluding punchline, which points out that Laelia's similarity in name to Lais, the archetypal *hetaira*, does not indicate a deeper equivalence between the two.⁶⁹ It is fair, then, to read the poem as a moral injunction to “know thyself,” especially in light of Martial's (seemingly) programmatic poem earlier in Book 10, where he suggests that his poetry is practically a manual for self-awareness.⁷⁰ In a more implicit sense, however, Laelia's story, at least as Martial tells it, might be read as a metaphor for the anxiety felt by Romans toward Greek culture. Laelia acts like a Greek: she speaks Greek (κύριέ μου,

⁶⁷ This and all Latin texts of the *Epigrams* are from Shackleton Bailey's 1990 Teubner edition.

⁶⁸ Hersilia was the wife of Romulus, Egeria the consort of Numa.

⁶⁹ This is essentially the reading of Johannes Hecker (Damschen and Heil (2004), 252) in his commentary on the poem. The name similarity may be arbitrarily-chosen on Martial's part, or it may reflect a subtle suggestion that Latin at its core, in the very names of its citizens, owed a linguistic debt to Greek. On the idea of Latin as a derivative of Greek, see Farrell (2001) 36-9.

⁷⁰ *Ep.* 10.4, esp. 9-12 (*non hic Centauros, non Gorgonas Harpyiasque / invenies: hominem pagina nostra sapit. / sed non vis, Mamurra, tuos cognoscere mores / nec te scire: legas Aetia Callimachi*). I will return to this poem later in my study.

μέλι μου, ψυχή μου 5), she makes herself up like a Greek (assuming that *numquam lita* at line 3 is meant to contrast Laelia's own appearance), she may even aspire to Greek learning (*tu licet ediscas totam referasque Corinthon...* 11).⁷¹ In much the same way, refined Romans were expected to know the Greek language and study Greek literary culture in a city decked out with Greek adornments – namely statues made by Greek sculptors or physically brought to Rome from Greece.⁷² Given the sheer omnipresence of a supposedly conquered people, it should come as no surprise that Romans would struggle to assert their own cultural identity. Here, Martial does acknowledge the existence of this identity in terms of Laelia's patrician background and pure Italian ancestry, but at the same time he dramatizes the challenges that the encroachment of Greek culture poses to any uncomplicated notion of being Roman. The poet-persona himself, with his virtuosic listing of Greek cities (1), his fluent Greek (5), and his allusion to a mysterious Corinthian education (11), admits a palpable Greek influence on his own epigram, and not an entirely pernicious one. For Martial, so thorough a mixture of Greek and Roman culture has made it easy for someone like Laelia to think that she can become Greek as easily as donning a mask. But this poem sounds a note of caution by reminding the reader that any such masquerade is futile, that being 'Roman' and being 'Greek' are two distinct (but not mutually exclusive) characteristics, and that a total reconciliation of the two is tempting but impossible.

This is an instructive example of Martial *qua* social commentator, but it is important

⁷¹ This complaint is revisited by Juvenal in his sixth satire, which itself uses Greek to drive home its point (194-6): *quotiens lascivum intervenit illud* / ζῶή καί ψυχή, *modo sub lodice relictis* / *uteris in turba* ("whenever that *mon chéri!* *mon cœur!* pops up, you're using in public words best kept between the sheets").

⁷² See Edwards (2003) for an excellent discussion of how Greek statuary in Rome may have been met with the same kind of ambivalence I am describing here.

to consider from a more practical standpoint why he introduces the tension in the first place. Humor is surely one reason – the whole joke is contingent upon a problematized relationship between Greek and Roman, and so a failure to emphasize this relationship would enervate the epigram. But although Martial was an entertainer first and foremost, we should not assume that his epigrams fail to address weightier issues, even if with tongue in cheek – any such argument would be reductive.⁷³ We must remember that Martial was also a Latin poet who himself had to contend – in the literary sphere – with the same tension as Laelia. The effect of the epigram is to point out how the narrator's approach to the problem is far preferable to Laelia's. He places himself in a position of superiority through his sustained didactic invective, simultaneously denigrating Laelia's unabashed imitation of Greek *hetairai* and suggesting instead that one must always keep in mind his (or her) Roman identity in order to maintain the precarious balance between the two cultures.⁷⁴ Insofar as the epigram is written as if from the pen of the author, it is easy (and, I would argue, intended) for the reader to associate this call for remembering Roman cultural identity with Martial's own beliefs. Accordingly, he comes across as a Roman poet devoted to honoring his Roman past who at the same time acknowledges that it is difficult, if not impossible, to ignore Greek influences. This sort of self-fashioning device enables Martial to enjoy the best of both worlds: on the one hand, he looks like an author who remains proudly Roman despite a constant onslaught of Hellenic influences; on the other hand, he still manages to acknowledge and even respect those same

⁷³ Spisak (2007) is equally wary of reducing Martial to pure comedy, although I find his alternative claim, that Martial self-consciously appointed himself a serious guide for proper and productive Roman social behavior, to take too little account of epigram as a typically 'light' genre and of Martial's frequently self-contradictory poetic persona.

⁷⁴ The idea of negotiating (rather than ignoring or resisting) cultural tension aligns well with Wallace-Hadrill's argument about Roman hellenism (86), even if his conclusions about how the Romans went about this negotiation do not map precisely onto my claims about Martial.

influences, which in Roman literary circles is the mark of a cultured and refined poet.⁷⁵

I. Martial the Bilingual: Greek Language in the *Epigrams*

Martial's use of Greek in the Laelia epigram – the only appearance of the language in Book 10 – may have come as a surprise to an unsuspecting Roman reader of his Latin verse. Despite the initially jarring effect, however, it is fair to assume that the same reader would not have had much trouble understanding what the Greek meant.⁷⁶ In the context of a book of Latin poetry, calling a reader's attention to the fact that he (the reader) is fluent in another language, especially a language with an ancient and distinguished literary pedigree, might produce something of an identity crisis. In his seminal work on Latin bilingualism, J.N. Adams effectively summarizes the crux of Roman "linguistic insecurity":

On the one hand the educated classes admired Greek culture and language, and aspired to fluency in Greek; but as the Romans gained political ascendancy over the Greeks they became keen to assert the dominance and superiority of their own language.⁷⁷

Throughout the *Epigrams*, Martial relishes exploiting this deep-seated insecurity. Before I can profitably consider individual poems, however, I must first make some general observations about the paradoxical role played by the Greek language in Roman literature and culture, as this relationship underlies all of Martial's bilingual epigrams, to varying degrees.

⁷⁵ When I say "respect," I am in agreement with Hecker's claim that the point of the poem is not to mock Greek notions of *hetaira* love (Damschen and Heil (2004), 251). If anything, Martial seems to suggest that Laelia is aspiring to a standard of uniquely Greek erotic refinement to which as a Roman matron she is unequal.

⁷⁶ This is not to assume an unproblematic or universal bilingualism among all of Martial's potential readers, but rather that he wrote in Greek with the understanding that a substantial portion of his audience would understand it. For a more nuanced consideration of Roman elite bilingualism, see J.N. Adams (2003) *Bilingualism and the Latin Language*. Cambridge: 9-14. Equally useful on this and related topics is J. Kaimo (1979) *The Romans and the Greek Language*. Helsinki.

⁷⁷ Adams (2003), 107-8.

As I mentioned in the introduction to this chapter, knowledge of Greek was a necessary component of an elite Roman's education. By the time Quintilian wrote the *Institutio Oratoria*, it was standard practice for children to be taught Greek before Latin, and he even claims that most (elite) parents (*I.O.* 1.12 *plerisque moris est*) would compel their children to speak Greek alone for a prolonged period of time (1.13 *diu*).⁷⁸ Whether or not Quintilian's claim was actually true, it serves to underscore the fact that on the whole fluency in Greek was taken for granted within educated circles. This assumption is very well attested in the Latin literary record – and Martial is no exception – not only through countless quotations of Greek literature, but also through numerous examples of code-switching from Latin to Greek and vice-versa. Code-switching is a prolifically studied phenomenon with no simple definition, but for the purposes of this study I will follow that of Adams, who defines code-switching as a “switch from one language into another within one person's utterance or piece of writing.”⁷⁹ Switches of code are particularly striking indicators of the degree to which Greek had become part of the Roman linguistic consciousness, and arguably all of the Greek in Martial represents some form of code-switching.⁸⁰ Accordingly, it will be useful to provide here a selective survey of the history of Greek-Latin code-switching as a literary phenomenon.⁸¹ In works of prose, code-switching is apparent as early as the late republic, and it is best

⁷⁸ *I.O.* 1.12-14. Quintilian himself disapproves of children speaking Greek exclusively for very long, as this runs the risk of introducing undesirable Grecisms into proper Latin speech.

⁷⁹ Adams (2003) 19. Seminal texts on code-switching outside the field of classics include J.-P. Blom and J.J. Gumperz (1972) “Social meaning in linguistic structures: Code switching in northern Norway” in J.J. Gumperz and D. Hymes (eds.) *Directions in Sociolinguistics*. New York; M. Heller (1988) *Codeswitching: Anthropological and Sociolinguistic Perspectives*. Berlin; and C. Myers-Scotton (2002). *Contact Linguistics: Bilingual Encounters and Grammatical Outcomes*. Oxford. More recently, see P. Gardner-Chloros (2009) *Code-switching*. Cambridge.

⁸⁰ Even his ‘quotations’ of Homeric epic and formulaic language are fitted to a Latin linguistic context (as I will discuss below), and so I regard these as code-switches and not actual quotations.

⁸¹ I will discuss the potential implications of code-switching, especially in terms of cultural identity, later in this section, mediated through specific examples in the *Epigrams*.

represented by Cicero's letters, throughout which Greek words and phrases are scattered with great frequency.⁸² Cicero's use of Greek is for the most part confined to the letters, which may reflect the opinion that such a practice is appropriate for private correspondence, but not so much for public use, as in speeches. Greek expressions are most common, unsurprisingly, in the letters to hellenophile and Athenian resident Atticus: a useful example is *Att.* 5.21.7 (*non ὑπερβολικῶς sed verissime loquor*, "I am not speaking hyperbolically, but with the utmost truth"), where Cicero uses Greek to distance himself from the potentially unflattering quality of exaggeration.⁸³ Ciceronian code-switching also appears in more unusual contexts, including a letter of recommendation to Caesar, where he attributes a verse to Euripides using a Greek genitive (*Fam.* 13.15.2): *itaque ab Homeri magniloquentia confero me ad vera praecepta Εὐριπίδου* ("therefore I turn from Homer's grandiloquence to Euripides' true teachings") [an unidentified quotation in Greek follows]. Interestingly, Cicero quotes Greek poetry throughout the second half of this letter to such an extent that he feels he must provide an explanation for why he has done this – his use of Greek verse, he claims, makes the letter an anomaly worth Caesar's attention (13.15.3): *genere novo sum litterarum ad te usus, ut intellegeres non vulgarem esse commendationem* ("I've used a new style of letter to you, so that you might recognize that this is no run-of-the-mill recommendation"). Cicero's flagging of this letter as uncommon (*genere novo, non vulgarem*) seems to impose a sense of 'otherness' onto the Greek quotation – its inclusion is such a departure from standard

⁸² For a thorough account, see Adams (2003), 308-47. The (by now familiar) social tension between Greek and Roman is no doubt at play here, as it is in Cicero's philosophical translations, which, as Yelena Baraz observes, can never be completely domesticizing; cf. Y. Baraz (2012) *A Written Republic: Cicero's Philosophical Politics*. Princeton, NJ: 127, and her third chapter in general.

⁸³ Adams classifies this example as 'meta-linguistic' (323), although he does not comment specifically on its euphemistic effect.

Latin epistolary practice that Cicero feels he must call attention to it as strange.⁸⁴ In fact, if the letter were someone else's, Cicero may well have mocked the author's over-the-top Greek affectation, which should remind us, as Joseph Farrell points out and as I will discuss frequently in Martial's case, that Cicero's approach here is at least partly humorous.⁸⁵ The younger Pliny's letters also make liberal use of Greek (e.g. 1.18.4 *egi tamen λογισάμενος illud εἰς οἰωνὸς ἄριστος ἀμύνεσθαι περὶ πάτρης*, "nevertheless I took legal action, considering the old expression, that 'one omen is best: to fight for one's country'" – a stylistic flourish and display of learning), as do works of prose fiction, in particular the *Apocolocyntosis* and Petronius' *Satyricon*.⁸⁶

Greek verse finds its way into the earliest extant Latin poetry as well. Plautus' comedies occasionally recall their Greek inspiration in language no less than in plot or setting.⁸⁷ His characters switch from Latin to Greek (indiscriminately transliterated or using Greek letters, as dictated by textual transmission) not only in the form of individual words, as at *Pers.* 29 (*basilice agito eleutheria*, "I'm royally celebrating the Feast of Liberty") where Plautus presupposes his audience's knowledge of the Greek festival known as *τά ἐλευθέρια*,⁸⁸ but also in the form of entire Greek phrases, such as *Stich.* 707 (*cantio Graecast: ἢ πέντ' ἢ τρία πῖν' ἢ μὴ τέτταρα*, "there's a Greek song: 'drink five or three, or at least not four'"). Regardless of whether this latter example is precisely a

⁸⁴ Of course Cicero casts this strangeness as innovation (*novo genere*) and refinement (*non vulgarem*), displaying his educated philhellenism, and in the process making himself stand out as exceptional.

⁸⁵ J. Farrell (2004) "Roman Homer" in R. Fowler (ed.) *The Cambridge Companion to Homer*. Cambridge: 254-71, esp. 263-4.

⁸⁶ S. N. Deane (1918) "Greek in Pliny's Letters" in *CW* 12: 41-4 provides a convenient catalogue. On the *Apoc.*, see M. Fucecchi (2003) "Il plurilinguismo della Menippea latina: appunti su Varrone satirico e l'*Apocolocyntosis* di Seneca" in R. Oniga (ed.) (2003) *Il plurilinguismo nella tradizione letteraria latina*. Rome: 91-130. On Petronius, see M.G. Cavalca (2001) *I grecismi nel Satyricon di Petronio*. Bologna.

⁸⁷ For a systematic overview of Greek words in Plautus, see J.N. Hough (1934) "The use of Greek words by Plautus" in *AJPh* 55: 346-64.

⁸⁸ Even the abverb *basilice* may have some Greek implications: cf. E. Fraenkel (2007) *Plautine Elements in Plautus (Plautinisches im Plautus)* (trr. T. Drevikovskiy and F. Muecke) Oxford: 130-2.

switch of code, it demonstrates the ease with which a Greek drinking song can be simultaneously made available to a speaker of Latin and self-consciously flagged as Greek by virtue of its language and the fact that it is sung by a Greek slave. In what survives of Lucilius as well, Greek and Latin are frequently mixed, to the great dismay of Horace, who along with his Augustan contemporaries disdained this practice as pretentious (cf. *Serm.* 1.10.34-5, Quirinus admonishes the poet for his attempts at Grecism: *in silvam non ligna feras insanius ac si / magnas Graecorum malis implere catervas*, “your wish to fill out the great ranks of the Greeks is as crazy as carrying wood into a forest”).⁸⁹ Lucilian code-switching comes most commonly in the form of single words (e.g. 331-2 W. = 303-4 M. *cum poclo bibo eodem... hoc est cum **psolocopumai***, “when I drink from the same cup [as she does]... that’s when I’m racked with tension”⁹⁰ – for lack of context it is difficult to explain Lucilius’ switch into Greek here, although the erotic subject may play a role). He also uses full Greek phrases, which are almost exclusively Homeric quotations recontextualized into everyday speech (e.g. 267-8 W. = 231-2 M. <nil> *ut discrepet ac **ton d’exerpaxen Apollon** / fiat*, “...so that it won’t matter and it’ll turn out as an ‘Apollo snatched him away’ situation”), a technique used also by Martial, and to be considered in depth later in this chapter.⁹¹ Non-comic genres of Latin poetry selectively use Greek language as well, as the fourth book of Lucretius’ *De rerum natura* amply demonstrates (4.1160-70 *nigra **melichrus** est, immunda et fedita **acosmos**, / caesia **Palladion**, nervosa et lignea **dorcas**...* etc., “the dark girl is ‘honey-skinned,’ the

⁸⁹ The most comprehensive treatment of the Greek language in Lucilius is A. Chahoud (2004) “The Roman satirist speaks Greek” in *Classics Ireland* 11: 1-46. She also provides a convenient appendix with all surviving examples.

⁹⁰ The translation of *psolocopumai* is Chahoud’s.

⁹¹ Horace, continuing his critique of Greek in Latin poetry, takes it upon himself to ‘translate’ Lucilius’ expression into good old-fashioned Latin (*Serm.* 1.9.78: *sic me servavit Apollo*).

dirty and foul one ‘disorderly,’ the grey-eyed one ‘a little Pallas,’ the tough and sinewy one ‘a deer’ ...”). In this case, the apparently popular Roman use of Greek pet names should already be familiar to us from the Laelia epigram, and it is important to note, as Adams does, that Lucretius, like Martial, places the code-switching into the mouth of another (hypothetical) person, which has the dual effect of elevating the poet himself to the status of aloof critic and distancing him from accusations of excessive hellenophilism.⁹² The distance grows wider still when we realize that Lucretius’ use of Greek is confined to satirical passages like these.⁹³

It is undeniable, then, that the Greek language was from an early period readily accessible to Latin authors and educated readers alike. At the same time, however, we must not assume that popular fluency in a language implies a total assimilation of that language into Roman culture. As we will see in the case of Martial, an author can have any number of motivations to switch codes, some of which rely on a conception of the Greeks as an alien entity. Code-switching can serve purposes ranging from utilitarian to self-fashioning: it can be, for instance, a rhetorical device, an ostentatious display of exoticism, or in the case of poetry an opportunity to demonstrate one’s metrical versatility.⁹⁴ The use of Greek can also, to borrow a phrase from Adams, “[place] the user and recipient within the hellenophile cultural elite,” especially if the Greek being used has a literary pedigree, which in turn creates a potentially advantageous shared (or even conspiratorial) intimacy between the poet and his knowledgeable reader.⁹⁵

⁹² Adams (2003), 30-1. See also Chahoud (2004), 26-7.

⁹³ See Farrell (2001) 39-51.

⁹⁴ On the first two items, see Wallace-Hadrill (1998), 85-6. For a somewhat more detailed treatment of code-switching as evocative of the exotic, see Adams (2003), 403-5. For Greek as a virtuosic stylistic device, cf. Adams, 300-1.

⁹⁵ Adams (2003), 337.

Such authorial motivations for code-switching are informative, but for a fuller picture we must also scrutinize the potentially alienating effects that using Greek in a Latin text might have on a reader. As I suggested at the beginning of this section, there is something jarring, both visually and conceptually, about the sudden appearance of Greek words in a predominantly Latin work. The Greek calls attention to itself, in no small part because it is not Latin. This distinction in turn leads the reader, unconsciously or deliberately, to question the author's choice of Greek instead of Latin: "What is it about this particular context that is so unusual as to require a foreign language? How does my understanding of 'Greek' (as opposed to 'Roman') inform my response to this passage?" In the case of the Laelia epigram, for instance, we might imagine that Martial's ideal Roman reader is amused by the speaker's derisive mimicry, and impressed by his ability to incorporate the Greek so seamlessly into his verse. At the same time, Martial has also made a persuasive case against a Roman matron who is acting quite unmatronly, even un-Roman, and a Greek expression placed in her mouth may serve as a damning piece of evidence. The reader might experience the resulting opprobrium alongside a sense of moral superiority to the low professional status of Greek women, while perhaps reluctantly acknowledging that he too has received a Greek education (after all, he can understand all of the references in the poem), or even consorted with a *hetaira* or two in his time – what would it mean if he were the *lascivus vir* (8) of whom the narrator speaks? It is clear, then, that a Latin author's use of Greek can encourage his reader to consider a complex variety of cultural opinions and questions, many of which directly struggle with the paradox of whether the Greeks are 'us' or 'them.'

My illustrative use of the Laelia epigram may suggest that Martial's code-switching

fits easily into the broad summary I have just presented. This is not always true: the sheer diversity of approaches that he takes to incorporating Greek into his epigrams warrants closer analysis of specific examples, because their effects, as well as Martial's apparent purpose(s) in producing these effects, do not fit quite so neatly into my generalized framework. The remainder of this section will aim to demonstrate the unique complexity of Martialian code-switching through careful consideration of select individual epigrams and groups of epigrams.

A recent attempt has been made by Alberto Canobbio to classify the different ways in which Martial uses Greek in the *Epigrams*. He proposes six rough categories: (1) proverbs and sayings; (2) representations of quotidian speech, especially erotic speech (he places the Laelia poem here); (3) technical/philological terms; (4) puns, especially on proper names; (5) Homeric quotations; and (6) wittily reinterpreted Menandrian titles.⁹⁶ While imperfect (several poems cross categories, while others defy classification), this taxonomy gives us a good idea of the breadth of Martial's engagement with the Greek language. Although I will not base the organization of this section strictly on Canobbio's categories (Homeric quotations in particular I have reserved for the end of the chapter due to their exceptional literary significance), it will nevertheless be helpful to keep them in mind as points of reference throughout.

As indicated by the first of Canobbio's groups, Martial on several occasions deploys well-known Greek aphorisms to give added point to his poems. The first instance occurs in Book 1, early in the poet's career. The epigram, second in a sequence of three poems

⁹⁶ A. Canobbio (2011a) "Parole greche in Marziale: tipologie di utilizzo e tre problemi filologici (3,20,5; 3,77,19; 9,44,6)" in A. Bonadeo, A. Canobbio, and F. Gasti (eds.) (2011) *Filellenismo e identità romana in età flavia: Atti della VIII Giornata ghisleriana di Filologia classica (Pavia, 10-11 novembre 2009)* Como-Pavia: 59-89.

on heavy wine consumption (1.26-8), is a hendecasyllabic admonition to the narrator's drinking buddy, a certain Procillus (*Ep.* 1.27):

Hesterna tibi nocte dixeramus,
quincunces puto post decem peractos,
cenares hodie, Procille, mecum.
tu factam tibi rem statim putasti
et non sobria verba subnotasti
exemplo nimium periculoso:
μισῶ μνάμονα συμπότην, Procille.

Last night I said you should have dinner with me today, Procillus – I think we had polished off three bottles by then. You immediately considered it a done deal, and made note of my less-than-sober words. This is an extremely dangerous precedent. I hate a drinking buddy with a memory, Procillus.

As Mario Citroni observes, the Greek expression chosen by Martial here to encapsulate the main invective point of his narrative – μισῶ μνάμονα συμπότην – was very well-known and is attested in other ancient sources.⁹⁷ Citroni, to some extent anticipating Adams' ideas on the use of Greek as a distancing device, suggests that by quoting the maxim in Greek Martial detaches it from the rest of the epigram, while, in spite of this detachment, simultaneously casting it as the most effective way to summarize the earlier part of the poem.⁹⁸ Citroni has drawn our attention to a discrepancy between (a) the isolating effect of using a Greek expression within a Latin poem and (b) using that same expression to epitomize the narrative. This tension is worth pressing a bit further. No doubt Citroni is right to suggest that the appearance of a string of Greek characters after six verses of Latin has the effect of separating the final line from the rest of the poem.⁹⁹ I would argue that this is intentional on Martial's part, not so much to make a profound

⁹⁷ Most famously in Lucian (*Symp.* 3, μισῶ γάρ, φησὶ καὶ ὁ ποιητικὸς λόγος, μνάμονα συμπότην) and Plutarch (*Quaes. Conv.* 612c, τὸ 'μισέω μνάμονα συμπότην', ὃ Σόσσιε Σενεκίων, ἔνιοι πρὸς τοὺς ἐπιστάθμους εἰρῆσθαι λέγουσι). Cf. Citroni (1975), ad loc. for more instances.

⁹⁸ Citroni (1975), n. intr. ad loc.

⁹⁹ This suggestion may be supported by the fact that the verse concludes the poem with an odd number of lines. The readers of Book 1, written mainly in elegiac couplets, would have been accustomed to epigrams with an even number of lines (prior to poem 1.27, only two, 1.7 and 1.17, have an odd number), so the final verse may well have stood apart, especially in Greek.

statement about cultural identity, but rather, on a purely practical level, to capture his audience's attention. But the distance and surprise that this technique creates thanks to the 'otherness' of the Greek must be weighed against Martial's expectation that most of his readers would not only understand the expression, but remember it as a proverb from other sources.¹⁰⁰ This constitutes an implicit acknowledgement that the Greek language has insinuated its way (aphoristically, at the very least) into the educated Roman vocabulary. Further, as Citroni observes, Martial consciously chooses a *Greek* expression as the most convenient way to summarize his point, which in turn gives the (semi-serious) impression that his Latin has not been up to the task.¹⁰¹ By playing on these tensions, Martial involves his audience in a game that he will reprise time and again throughout the *Epigrams*: identify the Greek expression, observe its relevance to the topic of the poem, and, for the more thoughtful reader, try to determine what this says about Roman cultural identity *vis-à-vis* the Greeks.¹⁰²

Another example of Martial's fluent use of a Greek saying can be found in Book 5,

¹⁰⁰ I use the term 'remember' pointedly, as Martial might be evoking the concept of literary memory with his μνάμων συμπότης.

¹⁰¹ I would not call this an argument for the so-called paucity of the Latin language, but rather a demonstration that Greek can be just as pointed and efficient as Latin. On other potential uses of proverbial expressions and *voces propriae*, see Adams (2003) 335-40.

¹⁰² In the case of poem 1.27, the game is rendered more interesting because the theme of the overly-attentive drinking partner is not unique to Martial – I would argue that a Greek epigram by second-century BCE poet Antipater of Sidon strikes some familiar notes (*AP* 11.31):

Οὐ μοι Πληιάδων φοβερὴ δύσις, οὐδὲ θαλάσσης
ὥρῳ στρυφελῶ κῦμα περὶ σκοπέλῳ,
οὐδ' ὅταν ἀστράπη μέγας οὐρανός, ὥς κακὸν ἄνδρα
ταρβέω καὶ μύθων μνήμονας ὕδροπότας.

The setting of the Pleiades doesn't scare me; neither do ocean waves rushing around a cruel bluff, nor when the great heavens hurl down lightning. What scares me is a wicked man, and water-drinkers who remember what I say.

Antipater's apparent adaptation (μύθων μνήμονας ὕδροπότας) provides evidence that a lapidary expression like μισῶ μνάμωνα συμπόταν lends itself quite well to the context of sympotic epigram, which in turn complicates Martial's playful challenge to his readers by raising the possibility of a Greek literary intertext. I will look at Martial's relationship with the tradition of Greek sympotic epigram in much greater depth in my third chapter.

although its presence will prove somewhat more complicated than in poem 1.27. This time, Martial aims his mockery at the ‘knight’ Calliodorus, who is attempting to elevate his *ordo* on a technicality (*Ep.* 5.38):

Calliodorus habet censum - quis nescit? - equestrem,
 Sexte, sed et fratrem Calliodorus habet.
 ‘quadringenta seca’ qui dicit, σῦκα μερίζει:
 uno credis equo posse sedere duos?
 quid cum fratre tibi, quid cum Polluce molesto?
 non esset Pollux si tibi, Castor eras.
 unus cum sitis, duo, Calliodore, sedebis?
 surge: σολοικισμόν, Calliodore, facis.
 aut imitare genus Ledaë: cum fratre sedere
 non potes: alternis, Calliodore, sede.

Calliodorus has enough wealth to be a knight, Sextus – who *doesn’t* know this? – but Calliodorus also has a brother. Whoever says “divide the 400,000” is splitting a fig: do you really think two people can sit on one horse? What does that irritating Pollux of a brother have to do with you? If you didn’t have a Pollux, you would be a Castor.¹⁰³ Since you’re both one, Calliodorus, will you sit as two? Get up. You’re committing a solecism, Calliodorus. Or copy Leda’s spawn – you can’t sit with your brother, Calliodorus, so take turns.

The theme of this poem – manipulating the rules of property classification for personal advancement – is rooted in Roman social practice (someone unfamiliar with the *census* would be quickly confused), and its crowning joke – Calliodorus’ solecism – requires a nuanced understanding of the Latin language. It might come as a particular surprise, then, that the epigram contains not one but two code-switches into Greek. The first of these, σῦκα μερίζει (3), is inserted so casually as to suggest that it was a common Greek expression, although this epigram serves as its only attestation. The absence of other contexts presents a challenge in determining the phrase’s precise significance, although this has not stopped generations of commentators from extrapolating based on its use in this poem.¹⁰⁴ Their interest is justified, however, given the obvious emphasis Martial places on the expression: not only is it in Greek, a technique which draws attention to

¹⁰³ I.e. “if only you didn’t have a brother (Pollux), then you’d be a true *eques* (= horseman = Castor).”

¹⁰⁴ For examples, cf. Canobbio (2011b) ad loc.

itself, as in poem 1.27, but it appears in the third line of a ten-line poem (an unexpected location), in a prominent metrical position (occupying the fifth and sixth feet of the hexameter). It is clear that Martial wants us to notice the phrase, but what is its significance? The gist is fairly apparent from the context – to try and split the minimum census qualification between brothers is as misguided as cutting a fig, already a small fruit, in half.¹⁰⁵ But why use a Greek proverb to sum up a distinctively Roman problem? It may be telling that, unlike in poem 1.27, where the speaker uses Greek to summarize his own admonitory sentiments, here the Greek criticizes someone else's piece of bad advice.¹⁰⁶ Perhaps, then, Martial uses Greek in this epigram to call attention to flaws in logic. We might support this hypothesis by considering the word σολοικισμόν (8), a surprising mid-line code-switch later in the poem. As Adams notes, it was not uncommon for Latin authors to use Greek technical terms, especially where a Latin periphrasis would be cumbersome (as, for example, in an epigram).¹⁰⁷ At the same time, though, I would argue that Martial's decision to use Greek here is not motivated exclusively by the desire for brevity, especially considering that a Greek phrase has already occurred in this poem and that he uses the Latin term *soloecismum* elsewhere.¹⁰⁸ σολοικισμόν, no less than σῦκα μερίζει, is surely an instance of marked code-switching. Further, as with σῦκα μερίζει, σολοικισμόν describes an error in thinking, this time a grammatical one (7 *unus...sitis*, *duo...sedebis*), and a ready opportunity for some

¹⁰⁵ Canobbio cites Paley-Stone's apt interpretation: "to make two bites of a cherry."

¹⁰⁶ Or at least bad practice. Textual issues mar the exact syntax of the line. Cf. Shackleton Bailey (1990) and Canobbio (2011b) ad loc.

¹⁰⁷ Adams (2003), 339–40.

¹⁰⁸ *Ep.* 11.19. Cf. Canobbio (2011b) ad loc. for further discussion. Although there is always some uncertainty about the textual transmission of Greek characters in otherwise Latin manuscripts, the difference between 11.19 and 5.38 is that for 5.38 at least one set of mss. (γ) transmits the Greek term, while for 11.19 the Latinized version is the only transmitted reading.

linguistic humor.¹⁰⁹

But why use Greek to describe bad Latin?¹¹⁰ In the case of Cicero's letters, Adams detects a steady pattern of code-switching whereby Cicero tactfully switches into Greek when he is describing faults (or potential faults), both his own and others'.¹¹¹ The effect, as Adams describes it, is quite relevant to Martial:

[W]hen writer and addressee mutually recognise that less is being said than implied (through, e.g., a partial quotation, or a proverb or citation the relevance of which to the context has to be deduced), that recognition establishes a sense of irony, which is not far removed from frivolity, humour or the like.¹¹²

Martial's use of Greek in poem 5.38, then, might be conceived as a kind of euphemism, not meant to spare his target, but rather inviting his readers to join with him in the same game I have already described in my discussion of poem 1.27: determine how the Greek relates to the context, and interrogate, perhaps, what this says about the relationship between 'Greek' as opposed to 'Roman.' This latter component necessarily produces more speculative arguments, but ones worth pursuing a little further. We might ask, for instance, whether Martial is asserting in this epigram a kind of Roman cultural (or at least linguistic) superiority by covertly claiming that the Greek language is better-suited to representing flawed logic than Latin. Such an idea may hold up if we imagine that the target of the poem's invective, Calliodorus, is himself Greek (after all, his *quadringenta* may well have been a "beautiful gift" from a deceased relative). While such an

¹⁰⁹ No doubt the term's appearance is also informed by Martial's engagement with the robust grammatical tradition, although space prohibits me from a full discussion. On the tradition of solecism in particular, cf. F. Charpin (1978) "La notion de solécisme chez les grammairiens latins" in J. Collart (ed.) *Varron, Grammaire antique et Stylistique latine*. Paris: 211-6. Martial generally has little good to say about grammarians (e.g. 2.7, 9.73, 10.21), modelling himself on contemporary Greek epigrammatists like Lucillius, who is equally derogatory (e.g. *AP* 11.278, 279) while at the same time still partial to esoteric linguistic humor (e.g. *AP* 11.314). My fourth chapter will address the relationship between Martial and Lucillius in much greater depth.

¹¹⁰ Farrell (2001: 37) too expresses his surprise that the Greek term *solecismum* was used to describe improper Latin usage.

¹¹¹ Adams (2003), 330-4.

¹¹² Adams (2003), 335.

interpretation must remain speculative, it nevertheless reminds us that we should continually scrutinize the extent to which Martial's code-switching has a distancing effect.

On other occasions, Martial expressly deemphasizes any such distance between the Greek and Latin languages. One poem, the first of several in Book 6 on the theme of adultery, offers a concise example (*Ep.* 6.6):

Comoedi tres sunt, sed amat tua Paula, Luperce,
quattuor: et κωφὸν Paula πρόσωπον amat.

There are three actors in a comedy, but your Paula, Lupercus, loves four. Paula loves a *muta persona* too.¹¹³

Martial's use of the Greek expression for 'extra' gives added punch to the joke, and in so doing displays a touch of virtuosic flair, especially with the synchysis of Greek and Latin words, a convenient – if extreme – visual example of the extent to which the Greek and Latin languages can coexist. At the same time, he assumes an audience familiar enough with Greek dramatic terminology to know what a κωφὸν πρόσωπον is in the first place. A particularly clever reader, moreover, might even detect in the Greek a double entendre on the *os impurum*, a frequent target of Martialian invective.¹¹⁴ Holt Parker discusses this possibility in considerable detail:¹¹⁵

The pleasure of the joke lies in undoing the puzzle and working out the nested allusions: πρόσωπον means *os*, and *os* means oral sex. The adjective κωφὸν also contributes to the obscene context, for the face is silent because the tongue is otherwise engaged.

Such a reference would require that the reader have a sophisticated grasp not only of what the Greek words literally mean, but also of how they can be related to Roman sexual attitudes. This constitutes yet another iteration of Martial's playful challenge to his

¹¹³ This translation is Shackleton Bailey's.

¹¹⁴ Cf. e.g. Sullivan (1991) 199-200. For the *os impurum* in Roman satire more broadly, see A. Richlin (1992) *The Garden of Priapus: Sexuality and Aggression in Roman Humor*. New Haven, CT.

¹¹⁵ H.N. Parker (1994) "Innocent on the face of it: an overlooked obscenity in Martial (6.6)" *Mnemosyne* 47: 380-3. See also Grewing (1997) ad loc.

audience to determine a Greek phrase's Roman cultural relevance; in this case, multiple levels of meaning add multiple layers of complexity to the game.

Closely related to Martial's use of bilingual double entendre is the extensive appearance in the *Epigrams* of Greek puns and wordplay.¹¹⁶ These occur in two forms: wordplay serving as the main point or punchline of a poem, and wordplay which lends added humor to a poem but is not necessary to understand it.¹¹⁷ As I have already pointed out, bilingual jokes, especially those upon which a poem's entire meaning hinges, necessarily require an audience who knows Greek, and this in turn reflects the extent to which the Greek language has been assimilated into educated Roman circles. At the same time, however, these jokes, most of which Martial deploys in low contexts or for invective purposes, call attention to themselves as being a banalized use of the language, and so we must ask whether the Greek has an alienating function as well. A closer look at some specific epigrams will reveal that Martial's wordplay can have some surprising cultural stakes.

Especially common in the *Epigrams* are Greek puns based on proper names, both ordinary and literary.¹¹⁸ Book 3 is an especially fertile source of these. In poem 67, for

¹¹⁶ For a summary treatment of puns and double entendres in Martial, including their significance in Greco-Roman literature and some examples I will not discuss here, see Sullivan (1991) 244-8. For a more thorough study, see U. Joepgen (1967) "Wortspiele bei Martial" Diss. Bonn.

¹¹⁷ The latter category poses the additional challenge of being less certainly identifiable – if Martial doesn't explicitly flag a word or name as being significant, can we be sure he is actually making a pun? For a liberal approach, see D. Vallat (2006) "Bilingual plays on proper names in Martial" in Booth and Maltby, eds. (2006): 121-43, but see also J.J. O'Hara's note of caution in his review of the volume (BMCR 2008.03.03). In the interest of space, I will confessedly avoid the challenge altogether by focusing only on epigrams where the reader must understand the pun to understand the poem.

¹¹⁸ Puns on Greek names in Latin are by no means unique to Martial, appearing as early as Plautus, but the large proportion of Greek vs. Latin names in the *Epigrams* (more than forty percent, cf. Vallat 123) warrants special attention. That said, Martial also puns on Latin names with no less comic effect, as we will see periodically throughout this study. For a thorough discussion, see J.M. Giegegack (1969) "Significant Names in Martial" Diss. Yale. More recently some scholars have used Martial's onomastic wordplay to make thematic and even narrative connections between epigrams: see N. Holzberg (2006) "Onomato-poetics: a linear reading of Martial" in Booth and Maltby, eds. (2006): 145-58, and R. Maltby (2006) "Proper names as a linking device in Martial" in Booth and Maltby, eds. (2006):

instance, Martial mocks a lazy group of oarsmen (3.67.10 *non nautas puto vos, sed Argonautas*, “you guys aren’t sailors, you’re Argonauts”), pretending that *Argonautae* is derived from the Greek words ἀργός (“unproductive”) and ναῦται (“sailors”). In poem 78, Martial jokes with Paulinus, a *gubernator* who has urinated off the side of his ship, that if he does so again he will be a real Palinurus (3.78.2 *meiere vis iterum? iam Palinurus eris*, “Do you have to piss again? That’ll make you a true Palinurus”), a pun relying on the false etymology of *Palinurus* from πάλιν (“again”) and οὐρέω (“to urinate”).¹¹⁹ In another epigram from Book 9, part of a sequence on Domitian’s beloved cupbearer Earinos (*Ep.* 9.13), Martial laments that while the three other seasons produce names which fit into his meter – *Oporinos*, *Chimerinos*, and *Therinos*, from ὀπώρα (“autumn”), χειμῶν (“winter”), and θέρος (“summer”) respectively – *Earinos* (from ἔαρ, “spring”) remains frustratingly unmetrical.¹²⁰

Worth closer examination is a pun on the name of a Greek doctor from Book 4, although the butt of the joke is the doctor’s daughter, who lavishly and inappropriately courts her paramour (*Ep.* 4.9):

Sotae filia clinici, Labulla,
deserto sequeris Clytū marito
et donas et amas: ἔχεις ἄσώτως.

Labulla, daughter of Dr. Sotas, you’ve left your husband to chase after Clytus; you give him gifts and love him – you’re sick in the head.

This untranslatable pun relies on the similarity between the first word of the poem, the doctor’s name, Sotas (placed in the Latinized Greek genitive *Sotae*), and the last word,

159-67.

¹¹⁹ Although the name Palinurus is very much associated with Latin in light of the character’s prominence in the *Aeneid* (and the continued existence of his namesake Capo Palinuro in the south of Italy), its actual origin is probably Greek, from πάλιν and οὐρός (“favorable wind”). For an overview of the evidence, see Z.P. Ambrose (1980) “The etymology and genealogy of Palinurus” *AJPh* 101: 449-57.

¹²⁰ I will return in greater detail to the Earinos sequence below.

ἄσώτως. The joke is that Labulla is not behaving as her father's name suggests she should. As Rosario Moreno Soldevila explains, the complexity of the wordplay here is remarkable: Sotas' name surely refers to σώζειν, his primary duty as a *clinicus*;¹²¹ in the case of Labulla, however, σώζειν (which conveniently can also mean 'to save money')¹²² is the last thing on her mind – the Greek word ἄσώτως, along with its cognates ἄσωτία and ἄσωτος, can refer to debauchery, squandering, or hopelessness, all of which accurately describe Labulla's chosen lifestyle.¹²³ Not only does this poem require that its reader know at least one meaning of the word ἄσώτως in order to get the joke, but Martial also rewards those readers who have a more nuanced understanding of Greek with a more satisfying punchline.

Martial makes a similar bilingual pun in Book 3, although here a woman does not simply exemplify the opposite of her (or her father's) Greek name (*Ep.* 3.34):

Digna tuo cur sis indignaque nomine, dicam.
frigida es et nigra es: non es et es Chione.

Why are you both deserving and undeserving of your name? I'll tell you. You're frigid and you're dusky – you are and aren't Chione.¹²⁴

The (again untranslatable) joke lies in the derivation of Chione's name from χιών, the Greek word for snow.¹²⁵ Chione resembles her namesake in being *frigida*, but not in being *nigra*. This epigram, which like the Sotas/Labulla poem relies entirely on the pun for its meaning, demands a fair amount of its reader. First, the reader must recognize that the name Chione (which, we should remember, is written in Latin script) comes from, or

¹²¹ This is not to say that Sotas would have been good at his job; Martial, following the Greek epigrammatic tradition, is notoriously unkind to doctors (1.30, 1.47, 5.9, 6.31, 6.53, 6.86, 8.74, 10.77, 11.71).

¹²² *LSJ* s.v. 2.

¹²³ Soldevila (2006) ad loc.

¹²⁴ Sullivan (1991) renders 'Chione' as 'Snow-White' (245). This is clever, but a little too anachronistic for my taste.

¹²⁵ Cf. also *Ep.* 11.60, where *Chione* and *Phlogis* (from φλόξ, "flame") are contrasted.

at least resembles, the Greek word χιών. Then, he must recall the meaning of the word and fit this meaning into the context of the Latin poem (“the woman Chione is cold and dark, whereas the natural phenomenon χιών is cold and white”). Finally, he must realize that Martial has exploited these similarities and discrepancies of quality in order to make fun of Chione’s frigid disposition and dark-skinned appearance.¹²⁶ Naturally, this mental process takes place in only an instant, but by breaking it down in such a way I have demonstrated the complicated series of comparisons that Martial’s reader must make between the Latin language of the poem and its relationship with the unstated Greek word on which the joke depends.

It is telling that this relationship itself demonstrates, on a small scale, a by now familiar phenomenon: an irreconcilable tension between conflicting identities. In a linguistic sense, Chione simultaneously is and is not (*non es et es*) Χιώνη. A bold reader might derive from this paradox a statement of cultural identity: Chione, a presumably Greek woman living in Martial’s Rome, only partially lives up to her Greek name. She is no longer fully Greek, but neither is she fully Roman, and we have once again run up against the Lais / Laelia tension; Chione thus provides a metaphor in miniature for Martial’s own ambivalent portrayal of Greeks in the Roman world. Such potential grains of social commentary should not be dismissed out of hand, even if the pun’s effect is primarily comic.

It should be evident based on the poems I have just discussed that most of Martial’s onomastic puns rely on the implicit assumption that a person’s name ought to match that

¹²⁶ Earlier in his career, Martial expresses a preference for a certain dark-skinned girl (1.115), but given the present context *nigra* is surely a negative characteristic. The poet is rarely consistent in describing his ideal woman. Chione, meanwhile, is the name of a maligned prostitute in four other poems from Book 3 (3.30, 83, 87, 97).

person's physical or moral characteristics. This idea that names can be significant was present from the earliest surviving classical literature through (and beyond) Martial's era.¹²⁷ It is particularly telling that in Martial's case, the great majority of 'speaking names' – or at least those which can be positively identified as such – are Greek.¹²⁸ This bilingual predilection might seem surprising, given that Latin names had no less potential to describe (or mismatch) their owners. Even so, Greek names, however common they may have been in Martial's Rome, were marked because they were not Latin, and accordingly they presented the poet with a unique opportunity both to demonstrate his cleverness by punning on the exotic and to involve the audience in his bilingual game. It is worth re-emphasizing here that this is no mere parlor game, but one with cultural stakes: Martial flags Greek names as 'other,' more noticeable and therefore more readily susceptible to irreverent linguistic humor, while simultaneously requiring an audience fluent enough in Greek to understand the humor in the first place.

Despite the identity crisis that these kinds of readers might face, it seems clear from Martial's name-play that he rewards them with the ability to appreciate his poems on multiple levels. This no doubt reflects how Martial, in line with the educated elite of his day, regards the ability to read Greek as an important indicator of one's social refinement. Epigram 9.44 provides a concise summary of this basic cultural assumption – as the narrator looks upon a statue of Hercules and inquires about the identity of its sculptor,

¹²⁷ In Greek literature, the Homeric 'speaking name' has been well-studied (cf. H. von Kamptz (1982) *Homerische Personennamen: Sprachwissenschaftliche und historische Klassifikation*. Göttingen), but other genres have seen more recent attention (e.g. N. Kanavou (2011) *Aristophanes' Comedy of Names: A Study of Speaking Names in Aristophanes*. Berlin). In Latin literature, the proper names of the *Aeneid* have long attracted scholars, but the net has been cast more widely in recent years (cf. esp. J. Booth and R. Maltby (2006) *What's in a Name?: The Significance of Proper Names in Latin Literature*. Swansea, Wales).

¹²⁸ There are some Latin examples as well (e.g. 6.17 on Furius/Fur, and perhaps 1.96 on the effeminate Maternus), but these are in the minority.

unaware of the Greek signature at the bottom, his interlocutor Vindex replies, *Graece numquid... poeta nescis?* “Do you, a poet, honestly not know Greek?” (4). Although the question is of course only half-serious, it nevertheless conveys Vindex’s expectation that an educated Roman, especially a *poeta*, simply must know Greek.¹²⁹ An epigram from the *Apophoreta* makes basically the same point, but introduces some complications (14.58):

Aphronitrum
Rusticus es, nescis quid Graeco nomine dicar:
spuma vocor nitri. Graecus es: aphronitrum.

Salt peter

If you’re a boor and don’t know my Greek name, I’m called ‘niter’s foam.’ If you’re Greek, ‘aphronitrum.’

The joke here seems to be that only a boor (*rusticus*) would not know the Greek word for saltpetre.¹³⁰ But the two options Martial presents to his addressee are peculiar: *rusticus es* or *Graecus es*. Martial is construing these choices as if they were natural opposites – as if *Graecus* were synonymous with *urbanus*, or *rusticus* with *Latinus/Romanus*. Of course from a Roman standpoint such an equation would be ridiculous, at least on some level, and I suspect that Martial is forcing his readers to laugh at his implicit overgeneralizations. But on another level this epigram reflects the depth to which the Greek language and culture had penetrated Roman society, to the point where *Graecus* can readily be a synonym not just for *urbanus* but for *Romanus*. This was literally true in that by the Flavian period the Greeks were citizens of the Roman empire, but Martial seems also to be suggesting a fundamental cultural assimilation – all Greeks may be

¹²⁹ I follow Housman’s reading of *poeta* (largely accepted) as a predicative nominative rather than a vocative. As Henriksen (1998) ad loc. explains, “such ignorance was especially embarrassing in the case of a poet.”

¹³⁰ Or at least the *aphro-* portion of the word. Note how Martial’s calque *spuma nitri* glosses only *aphro-* and leaves *-nitrum* alone. The joke is more pointed because, according to Martial, it would take a real idiot not to know the Greek word for foam, considering, for example, the name *Aphrodite*.

Romans, but all (educated) Romans are in some sense Greeks as well. We find a similar notion elsewhere in the *Epigrams*, as in poem 1.39 praising Decianus, who is *madidus Cecropiae Latiaeque Minervae*, “dripping with Cecropian and Latin Skill” (3).¹³¹ I read this phrase, which closely entwines the adjectives *Cecropiae* and *Latiae* by means of the enclitic *-que*, as a sweeping amalgamation of Greek and Roman arts.¹³² The next section of this chapter will examine the various ways in which Martial simultaneously embraces and complicates this artistic fusion.

II. Martial the Critic: Greek Literature and Art in the *Epigrams*

We have found so far that Martial’s engagement with the Greek language, which I have characterized as a learned linguistic game with cultural implications, presents a complicated picture: on the one hand, Martial’s effortless switches of code and frequent bilingual wordplay suggest a fluency and comfort with Greek – and by extension Greek linguistic assimilation into Roman society – which he expects some portion of his audience to share; on the other hand, these same code-switches and word games often call attention to their ‘Greekness’ in ways that have the effect of distancing Greek from Latin. No doubt this tension is a natural consequence of using a non-Latin language in a book of Latin verse, but as I have argued above, Martial makes no efforts to resolve the paradox and instead uses it to his poetic advantage. I move now from the realm of Greek language to that of Greek literature and art in the *Epigrams*, where we will encounter an equally tangled web of cultural observations.

¹³¹ As Citroni (1975) ad loc. points out, Martial returns to this imagery in the later books of the *Epigrams*. See especially 7.69.2 on the poetess Theophila, *cuius Cecropia pectora dote madent* (“whose mind drips with Cecropian talent”). I will discuss this poem further below.

¹³² Presumably literary arts, although the narrator neglects to specify.

In epigram 1.39, the poem with which I concluded my previous section, the harmonious phrase *Cecropiae Latiaeque Minervae* appears to suggest that Martial envisions a happy coexistence of Greek and Roman *artes* within Roman culture. From a physical standpoint, even a casual stroll through Flavian Rome would seem to bear this claim out, as Greek influences of all kinds were everywhere to be seen.¹³³ Andrew Wallace-Hadrill argues that Roman artists and architects were constantly negotiating the differences between the Greek and Roman traditions.¹³⁴ Sculpturally, Greek reproductions and original works on (traditionally Greek) mythological themes were common, but equally prevalent were examples of (traditionally Roman) artistic realism and historical or political subjects. At times, Wallace-Hadrill observes, the two traditions coexisted uneasily within individual works of art, and so we find statues of Roman emperors sporting idealized nude bodies, or a single frieze depicting both mythic and mundane themes.¹³⁵ Architecturally, Wallace-Hadrill detects a divide between the Romans' use of traditional Italic architectural systems in the public sphere and Greek ones in the domestic sphere. Whether or not this is universally true, he also points out – tellingly – that the architect Vitruvius uses Greek theory to demonstrate the supposed uniqueness of the Italic system.¹³⁶ The physical fabric of Rome, then, was in a very real

¹³³ On the topography of Flavian Rome in particular, see R.H. Darwall-Smith (1996) *Emperors and Architecture: A Study of Flavian Rome*. Brussels.

¹³⁴ Wallace-Hadrill (1998) 86-8. He focuses primarily on works produced under the Republic and imposes a chronological limit on the cultural importance of Greek/Roman physical juxtapositions (the second century CE), but Martial was nevertheless keenly aware of these juxtapositions, however mundane they may have become by the time he was writing.

¹³⁵ In line with the former category are 'hellenizing' portraits: Wallace-Hadrill cites a portrait of a Roman businessman from Delos with a jowly, large-eared head on an athlete's body. For the latter category, he adduces the *Ara Domiti Ahenobarbi*, which depicts the wedding of Poseidon and Amphitrite alongside an image of Roman census-taking.

¹³⁶ Wallace-Hadrill (1998) 89-91. He expands this argument into a chapter on Vitruvius in *Rome's Cultural Revolution* (2008), concluding that "Vitruvius' revolution lay in the demonstration that Greek theory could be reconciled with current practice in Italy without compromising identity" (145-7).

sense an amalgam of Greek and Roman artistic traditions.¹³⁷

Martial unabashedly acknowledges this reality in an epigram on Selius, a shameless parasite in constant search of a free meal (*Ep.* 2.14):¹³⁸

Nil intemptatum Selius, nil linquit inausum, cenandum quotiens iam videt esse domi. currit ad Europen et te, Pauline, tuosque laudat Achilleos, sed sine fine, pedes. si nihil Europe fecit, tunc Saepta petuntur,	5
si quid Philyrides praestet et Aesonides. hic quoque deceptus Memphitica templa frequentat, assidet et cathedris, maesta iuvenca, tuis. inde petit centum pendentia tecta columnis, illinc Pompei dona nemusque duplex.	10
nec Fortunati spernit nec balnea Fausti nec Grylli tenebras Aeoliamque Lupi: nam thermis iterum ternis iterumque lauatur. omnia cum fecit, sed renuente deo, lotus ad Europes tepidae buxeta recurrit,	15
si quis ibi serum carpat amicus iter. per te perque tuam, vector lascive, puellam, ad cenam Selium tu, rogo, taure, voca.	

The minute he realizes he has to eat at home, Selius leaves nothing untested, nothing unventured. He runs to Europa's place and praises you, Paulinus, and your 'Achillean feet' – without end. If Europa yields nothing, then the Saepta are his next target, to see if Philyrides and Aesonides will provide anything. If his plans are foiled here as well, he loiters around the Memphitic temple and besieges your throne, unhappy heifer!¹³⁹ From there he heads to the building supported by a hundred columns, and from there to Pompey's gift and the double grove. Nor does he scorn Fortunatus' baths, or Faustus', or Gryllus' shadows, or Lupus' Aeolian cave. The three hot baths, meanwhile, he washes in again and again. Once he's tried everything and the gods still say no, he runs back – clean, at least – to mild Europa's boxwoods, in case some friend is late in getting there. I'm begging you, bull,¹⁴⁰ and your girl (you lustful mount): *you* invite Selius to dinner.

This poem portrays a cosmopolitan city (very much like the Rome of Juvenal's first satire, full of targets for its poet's primed pen): its Roman origins are obvious (e.g. the *Saepta* with all its electoral connotations [5]; the *Pompei dona*, a portico near the famous theater [10]; the unspecified *thermae* of Agrippa, Nero, and/or Titus [12]), and Egyptian religious influence is present (the *Memphitica Templa* of Isis [7]), but most striking are

¹³⁷ Obviously this statement does not mean to exclude other traditions from the mix (the following poem betrays Egyptian influence, for instance).

¹³⁸ Selius is a recurring character in Book 2, appearing in four poems total (2.11, 2.14, 2.27, 2.69) as the archetype of shameless dinner-hunting. On the figure of the parasite in Martial, cf. Damon (1997).

¹³⁹ i.e. Io.

¹⁴⁰ i.e. Jupiter, who notoriously abducted (and mounted) Europa.

the reflections of Greek myth in Martial's Roman landscape.¹⁴¹ The otherwise unknown meeting place of Europa, allusively described here using only the goddess' name, plays an important role in the poem's narrative, framing Selius' journey on both ends and providing the final punchline. The story of Europa is attested from the earliest Greek literature (e.g. at *Il.* 14.321, where she is obliquely called Φοίνικος κούρη) through the Hellenistic period (most notably as the subject of the *Europa*, Moschus' famed epyllion), and while Roman poets before Martial may have adapted the tale for their own purposes (especially Ovid, *Met.* 2.833-75), Europa's Greek origins cannot have been forgotten by any educated reader of the *Epigrams*. In fact, even Selius himself seems to have the mythic tradition in mind during his first stop at the Europa meeting place – he affords his addressee Paulinus a Homeric quality, *Achilleos pedes* (4). Martial likewise locates Greek myth amidst the (very Roman) Saepta, calling attention to the sculptures of Chiron and Jason, even referring to the former by a Greek matronymic (*Phillyrides* 6) and the latter by a patronymic (*Aesonides* 6). We find further Greek topographical influence with the mention of the baths of Gryllus (a Greek name) and Lupus (given the derogatory adjective *Aeolia*, an allusion to the blustery caves of Aeolus).¹⁴² It seems clear, then, that this poem depicts a Rome physically marked by the Greek mythic tradition. Martial underscores this assertion by marking his own epigram with the Greek linguistic

¹⁴¹ Martial's allusions and circumlocutions in this poem are usefully explained by C.A. Williams (2004) *Martial Epigrams Book 2. A Commentary*. Oxford: ad loc. Also, although it should be apparent, I must nevertheless stress that my concern here is not to reconstruct a map of Rome, but rather to consider Martial's (selective) picture of the city in poetic terms. Some scholars have already done this, although their focus (mainly on tracing themes – dinner, wandering, cows, etc. – within the epigram and across other poems) differs from my own. Even so, their perspectives are broadly useful: cf. R.E. Prior (1996) "Going around hungry: Topography and poetics in Martial 2.14" *AJPh* 117: 121-41, and F. Sposi (1997) "Archeologia e poesia in due epigramma di Marziale (2,14; 7,73)" *Atene e Roma* 42: 16-27.

¹⁴² As Watson and Watson (2003) suggest, Martial seems to be using these as examples of lower-end baths, being dank and drafty (162). I am not, however, prepared to assert that the Greek references here are meant to reflect the baths' poor quality.

tradition: we find the nouns *Europen* (3) and *Europes* (15) in their proper Greek declensions, and a few other Greek words creep in throughout (*cathedris* 8, *thermis* 13).¹⁴³

This coexistence of Greek and Roman material culture does not necessarily imply an absolute harmony between the two, and the very fact that Martial categorizes some works as ‘Greek’ and some as ‘Roman’ suggests a degree of separation. In fact, Martial often describes Roman artists as competing with their Greek predecessors, and making a good showing of themselves in the process. The most common Greek competitor in the *Epigrams* is the sculptor Phidias, best known for the statue of Zeus at Olympia and the Athena Parthenos, and an artist whom Martial seems to hold in the highest esteem: in several poems, remarkable works of art, Greek and Roman alike, are held up to the Phidian gold standard.¹⁴⁴ Addressing a sculpture of the beautiful Julia, perhaps the daughter of the late emperor Titus, the poet asks, *quis te Phidiaco formatam, Iulia, caelo, / vel quis Palladiae non putet artis opus?* (“Julia, who wouldn’t think you were molded by Phidias’ chisel, or a product of Pallas’ skill?” *Ep.* 6.13.1-2). In the process of extolling the statue (and its subject) to the stars, this question expressly elevates Phidias by comparing his work with that of a goddess.¹⁴⁵ Another poem, mentioned briefly earlier, praises a statue of the Hellenistic sculptor Lysippus, again by comparison to Phidias (*Ep.* 9.44.5-6): *‘inscripta est basis indicatque nomen.’ / Lysippum lego, Phidiae putavi* (“the base is inscribed: it shows the name.’ I read ‘by Lysippus’ – I could have sworn it was by

¹⁴³ It is tempting to take the Latin periphrasis of *Hecatostylon* (*centum pendientia tecta* 9) as an exception to this trend, but the Greek name of the monument is unmetrical.

¹⁴⁴ In three of the nine poems where Phidias is mentioned (3.35, 4.39, 10.87), Martial reminds us of the sculptor’s Greekness by using the word *toreuma* (from the Greek τόρευμα, with the same meaning) to refer to his carvings. That Phidias deserves the gold standard is made clear early in the *Epigrams*: poem 3.35, for example, describes a Phidian relief depicting fish so realistic that they could actually swim if placed in water.

¹⁴⁵ On the historical background of this poem, cf. Grewing (1997) ad loc.

Phidias”).¹⁴⁶ Once again, Phidias’ appearance serves to compliment the work of a more recent artist, this time a Greek one. In another epigram, a well-known sculpture of Hera by Polyclitus, only a generation younger than Phidias, receives similar praise, described as a *gloria felix*, / *Phidiacae cuperent quam meruisse manus* (“glorious, fortunate sculpture – Phidias’ hands would love to take credit for you!”) (*Ep.* 10.89.1-2).¹⁴⁷ Martial even uses Phidias to characterize a statue of Priapus, who comically describes his endowments in the first person (*Ep.* 6.73.7-8): *sed mihi perpetua numquam moritura cupresso / Phidiaca rigeat mentula digna manu* (“but my dick stands solid, immortalized in enduring cypress, worthy of Phidias’ hand”). The invocation of Phidias’ sculptural mastery effectively elevates this Priapus – or this Priapus’ opinion of himself – to a level of artistic quality normally reserved for more dignified works than the wood-hewn statues of a rustic god.¹⁴⁸ Conversely, the use of the *Phidiaca manus* to describe a *mentula* serves also to cut Phidias down to (epigrammatic) size by applying his name to such debased subject matter, and his *manus* to Priapus’ *mentula*.¹⁴⁹ Martial’s Phidias, then, might not be as uncomplicated a metaphor for sculptural prowess as the previous poems seemed to suggest.

Indeed, things become more complicated once specific Roman craftsmen are brought into the mix. The following epigram on Rabirius, the architect who designed Domitian’s

¹⁴⁶ I read this poem, along with Henriksen (1998) ad loc., as offering genuine praise, *pace* R.M. Henry (1948) “On Martial IX. 44” *Hermathena* 71: 93-4, who suggests that Martial is calling attention to the statue as a forgery. Unfortunately, the textual status of the name *Lysippum* has long been thrown into question – some argue for the reading *Λυσίππου* (in Greek characters), and Henry’s argument relies on this reading. For a recent overview of the state of the question and a fair case for *Λυσίππου*, see Canobbio (2011a) 76-84.

¹⁴⁷ For background on Polyclitus and his statue of Hera, cf. C.R. Raschle in Damschen and Heil (2004), 316-7. An ecphrastic epigram by Parmenion (*AP* 16.216) describes the same statue.

¹⁴⁸ Cf. e.g. *Carm. Priap.* 10.3, practically a negation of Martial’s line: *nec sum Phidiaca manu politus*.

¹⁴⁹ Many thanks to Prof. James Ker for calling this double-entendre to my attention.

palace, introduces hints of a competitive element (*Ep.* 7.56):¹⁵⁰

Astra polumque pia cepisti mente, Rabiri,
Parrhasiam mira qui struis arte domum.
Phidiaco si digna Iovi dare templa parabit,
has petet a nostro Pisa Tonante manus.

Your faithful mind comprehended the stars and the sky, Rabirius, and you built the Parrhasian house with marvelous skill. If Pisa wants to give a worthy temple to Phidias' Jove, she should ask our own Thunderer for these hands.

I would argue that this poem sets up an implicit standoff between Rabirius and Phidias.¹⁵¹

Even though the two create different kinds of art (Rabirius designs buildings, while

Phidias sculpts statues), Martial nonetheless places them on equal footing in their

respective fields, which in turn invites some form of comparison. On a broad level, both

men have designed monumental constructions in honor of divine rulers. More

specifically, consider first the opening couplet's overwhelming praise of Rabirius, which

has three angles: he has a sense of quasi-religious duty (*pia mente*), he is capable of

comprehending the loftiest astronomical phenomena (*astra polumque*), and he is

unbelievably skilled (*mira...arte*).¹⁵² All of these qualities might just as easily be applied

to the Phidias we have met elsewhere in the *Epigrams*, whose great skill (*ars*), tendency

toward divine subject matter (*pietas*), and lofty aspirations (his statues of Zeus and

Athena quite literally stretched toward the *astra polumque*) have been well-established.¹⁵³

It might be unsurprising, then, that the second half of the poem turns to Phidias'

¹⁵⁰ Our only knowledge of the historical Rabirius comes from this epigram and *Ep.* 10.71. The palace of Domitian, however, is much better-attested, even in poetry: Martial's contemporary Statius describes the structure ecphrastically in *Silvae* 4.2.

¹⁵¹ It should go without saying that this poem indirectly praises Domitian, the earthly Jupiter, and his building programme through Rabirius (on which see Galán Vioque (2002) intr. n. and ad loc.), but my focus here is on the 'vessel' rather than the subject.

¹⁵² Piety, lofty thought, and great skill might be subsets of artistic sublimity, and Martial may well be participating here in the longstanding literary discourse on the sublime, as his fellow Spaniard Seneca the Younger certainly was (on which see G. Williams (2012) *The Cosmic Viewpoint: A Study of Seneca's Natural Questions*. Oxford).

¹⁵³ The quality of *pietas* is similarly associated with Phidias in Statius' *Silvae* 5.1, a consolation to a husband on the death of his wife (4-6): *namque egregia pietate meretur / ut vel Apelleo vultus signata colore, / Phidiaca vel nata manu reddare dolenti*. But in this case, Phidias would be rewarding the husband's dutifulness with a statue of his wife rather than exhibiting the virtue himself.

Olympian Zeus, which according to the poet is worthy of only the finest shrine (*digna templa*). In the context of this poem, Rabirius is the only man capable of designing such a shrine. To some extent, this epigram resembles the other Phidiocentric poems I have already discussed, in that Phidias represents the gold standard of artisanry, against which all other such work should be compared. But the difference here is that the comparison involves a well-known contemporary Roman artisan, not an anonymous (6.13), Greek (9.44, 10.89), or Priapic (6.73) one. Panegyrically comparing a living Roman (with imperial ties no less) to a long-dead Greek has the effect of praising the Roman at the expense of reducing the Greek to type. Phidias has become for Martial, in this poem perhaps more noticeably than in the others, the stereotypical example of excellent craftsmanship, and while this undoubtedly reflects the high regard with which Martial held the sculptor, at the same time it enables him to use Phidias as a rhetorical device for his panegyric.¹⁵⁴

Phidias' panegyric value is especially obvious on the only occasion where Martial pits him explicitly against a contemporary Roman sculptor. The epigram (*Ep.* 9.24) is addressed to Carus, a poet who won a golden olive wreath at Domitian's Alban games, the *Quinquatria Minervae*. We learn from the previous poem (9.23) that the wreath found its way to a bust of the emperor of its own accord (*"aspicis en domini fulgentes marmore vultus? / venit ad has ultro nostra corona comas"*),¹⁵⁵ and Martial devotes poem

¹⁵⁴ Martial was not alone in recognizing the value of Phidias as a rhetorical device. Dio Chrysostom, in his twelfth oration (*Olympicus*, delivered before Phidias' statue of Zeus), devotes nearly half of the speech (55-83) to an *apologia* in Phidias' own words (fictional, of course) for sculpting the supreme god in anthropomorphic form. While differences of genre enable Dio to develop a much subtler portrayal of Phidias than can Martial, Dio has still reduced the sculptor to a mouthpiece for his own thoughts on anthropomorphized gods, the nature of art, and the differences between sculptural/visual and literary arts. For analysis and commentary on this speech, see D.A. Russell (ed.) *Dio Chrysostom: Orations VII, XII, XXXVI*. Cambridge.

¹⁵⁵ Cf. Henriksen (1998) intr. n. ad loc.

9.24 to praising the bust in question:

Quis Palatinos imitatus imagine vultus
 Phidiacum Latio marmore vicit ebur?
 haec mundi facies, haec sunt Iovis ora sereni:
 sic tonat ille deus cum sine nube tonat.
 non solam tribuit Pallas tibi, Care, coronam;
 effigiem domini, quam colis, illa dedit.

Who, in rendering a bust of the Palatine countenance, has surpassed Phidian ivory with Latin marble? This is the face of the universe, this is the visage of Jupiter the serene – this is how that god thunders when he thunders from a cloudless sky. Pallas did not just present you with a crown, Carus, she gave you the lord's likeness, which you worship.

To suggest that this epigram is designed as a panegyric for the sculptor of the bust would, of course, be absurd – the poem is obviously a thinly-veiled eulogy for Domitian, while the sculptor himself is not even named. Even so, Martial's effusive praise of the bust, whatever its actual intent, contains some interesting cultural commentary. The interrogative first couplet immediately calls the reader's attention to the agency of the sculptor – this poem is about the creator of the bust, and not merely its viewer, whose passive admiration we saw at the similarly-phrased opening of epigram 6.13 (*quis te Phidiaco formatam, Iulia, caelo... non putet...?*). Given this epigram's focus on active creation, any mention of Phidias will inevitably place him in direct competition with his Roman counterpart.¹⁵⁶ Unlike the implicit comparison with Rabirius, this contest has decisive results: Phidias is the inferior craftsman (1-2 *quis... Phidiacum... vicit ebur?*). The Roman sculptor, moreover, wins despite a severe disadvantage, forced to use inferior *Latium marmor* instead of *Phidiacum* (Greek) *ebur*.¹⁵⁷ No doubt part of the reason for this victory is that the subject of the Roman bust is Domitian, whom Martial unabashedly likens to Jupiter, the subject of Phidias' Olympian statue (3-4 *mundi facies; Iovis ora*

¹⁵⁶ It is also likely that the context of the Alban games, continuing from poem 9.23, introduces a competitive element to this poem, which facilitates a showdown between Phidias and the Roman.

¹⁵⁷ On the respective qualities of these sculpting materials, see Henriksen (1998) ad loc.

sereni; deus sine nube). Nevertheless, it is also tempting to read a metapoetic layer of meaning into the Roman sculptor's defeat of Phidias against all odds: perhaps this is a passing observation on the superiority of Roman literature despite its disadvantaged (or belated) status in the face of the rich Greek tradition.¹⁵⁸

All of this lends itself well to reading epigram 9.24 as a triumphant statement of Roman artistic superiority over the Greek masters, but Martial seems to include a few caveats. It bears repeating that Martial never provides a direct answer to the first couplet's question – we never learn the identity of the *quis*, and, as in 6.13, the sculptor remains anonymous. Instead, the final couplet presents a twist, perhaps unexpected given the decisiveness of the craftsman's victory over Phidias: Minerva herself gave the bust to Carus (6 *effigiem domini, quam colis, illa [Pallas] dedit*). There are two contradictory ways to interpret this conclusion. On the one hand, we might view the statement as a culmination of the poet's praise: "the bust is so well-crafted that it resembles a gift from the gods." On the other hand, it might be read as a sudden realization: "actually, no Roman sculptor is talented enough to have made this bust – Pallas must have made it herself." I would argue that Martial intentionally leaves both possibilities open in order to underscore the tension produced by Rome's "identity crisis" (to again use Adams' term). On one reading, Roman plastic arts can surpass the very best the Greeks have to offer; on another, they cannot.

In considering Martial's ambivalent treatment of Greek sculpture and architecture,

¹⁵⁸ Latin's uphill battle against the Greek tradition is most striking in the realm of language, as the *patrii sermonis egestas* topos makes clear, on which see Farrell (2001). It is unlikely that Roman writers are actually crippled by the paucity of their literary tradition or language at this point – Roman predecessors were no less available to Martial than Greek ones, and Latin was used in just as many literary contexts as Greek had been. But as Rosen (2007) argues, there is satirical advantage in adopting the stance of the underdog, whether or not that stance is real.

we have gained some crucial insight into how he conceives of the Greeks as creators of art *vis-à-vis* their Roman counterparts. More directly relevant to Martial as a poet are his similarly equivocal observations on the relationship between Greek and Roman literary arts. In epigram 1.25, he describes the as-yet-unpublished *libelli* of one Faustinus in glowing terms (*Ep.* 1.25.3-4): *quod nec Cecropiae damnent Pandionis arces / nec sileant nostri praetereantque senes* (“a work that neither Pandion’s¹⁵⁹ Cecropian heights would reject, nor our ancestors silently pass by”). Although we might observe simply that the phrase *Cecropiae Pandionis arces* provides an Alexandrian flourish to an otherwise Latin poem and leave our analysis at that, a less reductive reading may be more satisfactory. The *nec...nec* structure of the couplet aligns the two subjects, *Cecropiae arces* and *nostri senes*, which sweepingly represent ancient Athenians and ancient Romans, both of whom, according to Martial, are qualified to pass judgment (*damnent... sileant... praetereant*) on literary matters. It is significant, I would argue, that Martial syntactically positions representatives of the Greek literary tradition on equal footing with those of the Latin literary tradition to which he proudly belongs. Despite this apparent equivalence, however, the first-person possessive adjective *nostri*, modifying *senes*, implicitly unites the poet and his audience with the Roman side of the tradition, a subtle reminder that the *Cecropiae arces* are still not fully integrated into Roman cultural identity as Martial portrays it.¹⁶⁰

This juxtaposition naturally breeds rivalry, and on three notable occasions Martial

¹⁵⁹ A legendary king of Athens.

¹⁶⁰ The parallel words *arces* and *senes* introduce another possible disconnect by representing the Greeks using a monarchical (or even tyrannical; cf. L&S s.v. *arx* I.C.) term and the Romans with a republican one. Might Martial be implying that Greek literary sensibilities can be cast aside as justifiably as the Roman kings were? This would of course be problematized by the fact that when Martial was writing Rome had basically returned to a state of monarchy.

compares a famous Greek poet, in all three cases a lyric poet, with a past or contemporary Roman analog. We will first consider a flattering epigram addressed to a certain Cerrinus – who refrains from publishing his own masterful epigrams for the sake of his less gifted friend Martial – in which Pindar is indirectly pitted against Vergil (*Ep.* 8.18.5-8):

sic Maro nec Calabri temptavit carmina Flacci,
Pindaricos nosset cum superare modos,
et Vario cessit Romani laude cothurni,
cum posset tragico fortius ore loqui.

In much the same way, Vergil didn't try his hand at the songs of Calabrian Flaccus,¹⁶¹ though he knew how to outshine Pindar's meters, and he yielded to Varius in renown for the Roman buskin,¹⁶² though he was able to speak the tragic tongue more powerfully.

While this poem offers great potential for understanding Martial's relationship with his patrons, not to mention his propensity for literary posturing (he may not be a Vergil, but he *is* both a Horace and a Varius), here I will restrict my focus to his remarks on Vergil's hypothetical superiority to *Pindarici modi* (6). Admittedly Martial does not refer to Pindar by name, but rather refers to the 'Pindaric' measures for which he was known; in one sense, Martial is using Pindar as a one-dimensional stand-in for the pinnacle of lyric poetry, much as he does with Phidias and sculpture (indeed, the repeated appearances of the possessive adjective *Phidiacus* in the Phidian poems discussed above should attune our senses to the potentially metonymic force of *Pindaricus* in this poem). But it is important to remember that Pindar, unlike Phidias, was a poet, and as such, by virtue of his presence in the Greek poetic tradition, he was also a distant rival of Martial, who was himself not averse to dabbling in lyric meters.¹⁶³ Therefore we should give some

¹⁶¹ Horace, in his capacity as lyric poet.

¹⁶² L. Varius Rufus, best known for his tragedy *Thyestes*. Varius also wrote an epic *De Morte*, a genre in which Vergil evidently had no qualms about eclipsing his friend. Cf. Schöffel (2002) ad loc.

¹⁶³ Albeit very rarely, and never in direct imitation of Pindaric meter: he uses iambic epodes in 1.49, 3.14, 9.77, and 11.59. Poems 11.77 and (possibly) 6.12 are composed in iambic trimeters, whose influence on certain lyric meters is apparent. For an exhaustive analysis of Martial's meters, see R.M. Marina Sáez (1998) *La métrica de los epigramas de*

interpretive weight to Martial's claim that Vergil, a Latin poet, would have been perfectly capable of competing with and defeating (*superare*) the Greek representative of a genre in which Vergil himself did not publicly write. Such a claim works in Martial's favor – despite his self-effacing stance here – no less than in Vergil's: because the poem introduces the notion that a Latin poet can surpass a Greek one, the possibility opens up that Martial, capitalizing on a sense of solidarity among Roman poets, can do so as well, if he hasn't already.

In the case of the other two poems on Greek-Roman lyric rivalry, the question of Roman poetic solidarity is complicated by the fact that all of the competitors in these poems are women. This gender discrepancy introduces a number of contradictions and double-standards which will problematize any straightforward reading and must be negotiated by the reader accordingly. In the first poem, Martial eulogizes Theophila, his friend Canius Rufus' betrothed, as worthy of inclusion in the ranks of the foremost Greek philosophers and poetesses; he concludes with a favorable comparison to Sappho (*Ep.* 7.69.9-10): *carmina fingentem Sappho laudarit amatrix:/ castior haec et non doctior illa fuit* ("amorous Sappho would heap praise on her writing of poems; the one [Theophila] is more chaste and the other [Sappho] is no more learned"). While the beginning of the poem seems to assimilate Theophila into the Greek literary tradition, thereby affording that tradition a privileged status, it ends on a less harmonious note.¹⁶⁴ The competition here is just as conclusive as in the case of Vergil and Pindar, but on different grounds:

Martial: Esquemas rítmicos y esquemas verbales. Zaragoza.

¹⁶⁴ We must also consider the question of whether Theophila is writing in Greek or Latin, which the poem leaves unanswered. Her Greek name may suggest the former, but even if this is the case, by marrying Canius Rufus she becomes a very much Roman woman. The idea of a Roman woman writing Greek poetry recalls Laelia and her Greek blandishments, although it is interesting that Martial praises Theophila while condemning Laelia. Perhaps Martial is particularly aggrieved by Laelia's 'betrayal' of her Roman heritage, but perhaps also the contradiction between the two poems reflects a deeper tension he experiences in trying to define 'Roman' against 'Greek.'

Theophila at the very least ties with Sappho when it comes to the quality of her poems (*non doctior*), but ultimately defeats her due to her less erotic subject matter (*castior*). This last point carries with it the implication, appropriate in an epigram on a friend's fiancée, that because Theophila's poems are chaste, so is she (or vice-versa). This claim – that a woman's poetry mirrors her morality – of course presents a blatant double-standard between female poets and epigrammatists like Martial, who follows Catullus' lead in distancing his personal values from the obscenity of his poetry.¹⁶⁵

But does this unusual alignment of poetic skill, thematic propriety, and moral uprightness in a Roman female poet serve any purpose for Martial the Roman male poet? The second Sappho epigram (*Ep.* 10.35) may shed some light on this question.¹⁶⁶ Martial opens the poem with a recommendation that his female audience (or their husbands) educate themselves on the lawful *ars amatoria* by reading Sulpicia (1-2): *omnes Sulpiciam legant puellae / uni quae cupiunt viro placere* ("Let any girl who wants to please a single man read Sulpicia"). He then proceeds to praise Sulpicia's admirable aversion to mythical topics and her astounding ability to be both *nequam* (11) and *sancta* (12). Toward the end of the epigram, Martial again introduces Sappho as a comparandum (15-18): *hac condiscipula vel hac magistra / esses doctior et pudica, Sappho:/ sed tecum pariter simulque visam/ durus Sulpiciam Phaon amaret* ("If she [Sulpicia] were your fellow student or instructor, you would have been more learned, Sappho, and chaste; but if stonehearted Phaon¹⁶⁷ had seen you two together, he would have fallen for Sulpicia"). Again we encounter an indirect competition between Sappho and a contemporary Roman

¹⁶⁵ E.g. 1.4.8: *lasciva est nobis pagina, vita proba*, "my page is impudent, my life honest"; see also n.122 below.

¹⁶⁶ For a useful analysis of this poem and its companion piece 10.38, see A. Richlin (1992) "Sulpicia the satirist" *CW* 86: 125-40.

¹⁶⁷ According to legend, the object of Sappho's unrequited love and the cause of her subsequent suicide.

female poet: according to Martial, Sulpicia's intervention would have improved Sappho's talent (*doctior*, as in 7.69) and given her some much-needed *pudor* (unlike the comparative *castior* in 7.69, note here the positive adjective *pudica*, which by its absoluteness elevates Sulpicia an extra degree over Sappho). But Martial's suggestion that Phaon would have fallen for Sulpicia – and subsequently been rejected in lieu of her beloved Calenus (10.35.19-21) – adds a physical dimension to Sulpicia's superiority to Sappho. Martial has in essence fashioned Sulpicia into the perfect Roman poetess, better than the best that the Greeks could offer.¹⁶⁸ And although Martial is far from the perfect Roman poetess, he nevertheless seems to have an affinity with Sulpicia, a composer of playful Latin poetry in much the same spirit as Martial's own body of work (8-9 *castos docet et pios amores,/ lusus, delicias facetiasque*, “she tells of chaste and honorable affections, dalliances, darlings and jests”). Moreover, as Amy Richlin observes, Martial is here making on Sulpicia's behalf the kind of *apologia* that his own predecessors (namely Catullus and Ovid) were accustomed to make for themselves.¹⁶⁹ It is reasonable, then, to suggest that Martial's remarks on female poets can to some extent apply to male poets as well, and so I would argue that both this and the previous epigram – perhaps ironically, given their partially gender-based definitions of what makes a good poet – unite to emphasize the superiority of Roman to Greek poetry.

These few comparisons between specific Roman and Greek poets are accompanied

¹⁶⁸ To be fair, Martial relates very few specifics about the content of Sulpicia's work, and this epigram should also be read alongside *Ep.* 10.38, which ignores Sulpicia's poetry altogether in favor of her marriage to Calenus. For a fuller discussion of Martial's valuation of Sulpicia as a poet, see Farrell (2001) 70-4.

¹⁶⁹ Cf. Richlin (1992) 129 for a more nuanced version of this argument: “Here, rather than a male poet claiming that writing love poetry does not mean he himself is *mollis*, effeminate (Catullus), or a male poet claiming that he is teaching the ways of love to prostitutes rather than to married women (Ovid), we have a male poet claiming that a female poet is writing of an erotic love such as might exist between happy husband and wife – i.e. she herself is not promiscuous. (Note how this preeminent claim to subjectivity is here preempted, by a male on behalf of a female.)”

in the *Epigrams* by equally few remarks on the relationship between Greek and Roman literature writ large. Martial's comments in this sphere are decidedly ambiguous, but even so they are of vital importance in understanding how he negotiates the tension between his reliance on the Greek tradition and his desire to surpass it. A poem from Book 2 defines Martial's poetry in opposition to other, flashier forms of verse whose Greek origins he makes apparent (*Ep.* 2.86):

Quod nec carmine glorior supino
nec retro lego Sotaden cinaedum,
nusquam Graecula quod recantat echo
nec dictat mihi luculentus Attis
mollem debilitate galliambon,
non sum, Classice, iam malus poeta.
quid si per gracilis vias petauri
invitum iubeas subire Ladan?
turpe est difficiles habere nugas
et stultus labor est ineptiarum.
scribat carmina circulis Palaemon,
me raris iuvat auribus placere.

I don't pride myself on backward poetry or read Sotades the Pervert in reverse.¹⁷⁰ Nowhere in my work does a Greek echo resound, and splendid Attis doesn't recite me his galliambos, soft in their lameness.¹⁷¹ Even so, Classicus, I'm not a bad poet. What if you told Ladas to get up on the narrow tightropes against his will?¹⁷² It's embarrassing to make trifles troublesome, and working hard on silly things is idiotic. Let Palaemon write poems for the masses – I'm content with pleasing a few choice ears.

This poem is one of the few 'programmatic' statements to be found in the *Epigrams*, arranged in a neatly bipartite structure: in the first half, Martial enumerates the kinds of poetry in which he takes no part, perhaps responding to accusations to the contrary, and in the second half, he explains why his selectivity is justified. This epigram's interaction with the Greek (namely Hellenistic) poetic tradition has attracted the attention of a fair number of scholars, and their observations are worth comparing. Sullivan argues that Martial is here renouncing the "pedantic *tours de force*" of certain Alexandrian poets –

¹⁷⁰ Sotades was a third-century Hellenistic poet, best known in antiquity for his obscene, occasionally invective, poetry, and the meter in which he wrote, the Sotadeus. Cf. *NP* s.v. Sotades(2).

¹⁷¹ An allusion to Catullus 63, written in galliambos.

¹⁷² Ladas was evidently a popular athlete (possibly a runner) in Martial's Rome. Cf. Williams (2004) ad loc.

even as he implicitly accepts Callimachean brevity – in favor of appealing to a more selective audience.¹⁷³ Indeed, Martial emphatically distances himself in this poem from overly clever Greek poets, past (Sotades, 2) and present (Palaemon, 11) alike. He even shifts responsibility for Catullus 63’s *mollis galliambos* (5) from Catullus himself to the mythical Attis, who, though Phrygian, is surely meant here to evoke the emasculating influence of Greek (“Attic”) metrical *debilitas*. Williams, however, reminds us to take Martial’s polemic with a grain of salt, given that the poet is himself not averse to using the same kinds of metrical tricks he condemns – in fact he uses what might be characterized as a *Graecula echo* just two poems later (*Ep.* 2.88: *nil recitas et vis, Mamerce, poeta videri./ quidquid vis esto, dummodo nil recites*).¹⁷⁴ Further, once Martial starts to reflect on book composition later in his career, he directly (if not purposefully) contradicts his general remarks here. *Turpe est difficiles habere nugas* (9) is met in Book 7 by *facile est epigrammata belle / scribere, sed librum scribere difficile est* (“it’s easy to write a nice epigram, but hard to write a nice book,” *Ep.* 7.85-3-4). In Book 12, he describes the difficult process of revising his previous two books, which in their unabridged form were a *longior...labor* (12.4.1-2) – the Martial of poem 2.86 might regard this *labor ineptiarum* as *stultus* (10). Martial ultimately does what he condemns: he has made his *nugae* troublesome by arranging them into books.¹⁷⁵ Most recently, Margot Neger has identified verbal and thematic parallels between this poem and a famous epigram of Callimachus (28 Pf. ἐχθαίρω τὸ ποίημα τὸ κυκλικόν...). These

¹⁷³ Sullivan (1991) 74-5.

¹⁷⁴ Williams (2004) intr. n. ad loc. For metrical play in the *Epigrams* see e.g. 5.24, 7.10, 9.57, 9.97.

¹⁷⁵ This is of course a very different kind of *labor* than the poetic pyrotechnics he is talking about here, but the parallel language is telling nonetheless. And while we might regard the remarks from Books 7 and 12 as those of a man wearied by the burden of many prior poems, I would suggest that even as early as his second book he was fully aware of the work involved in writing epigram, and that the generalizations in 2.86 are at least partially tongue-in-cheek.

allusions, she suggests, establish Martial both as an “anti-Callimachus” and as an able practitioner of Callimachean poetics (a trait validated by poem 2.88).¹⁷⁶ As my arguments above should make apparent, I agree with Neger’s ambivalent reading: even independently of potential Hellenistic influences, an implicit uncertainty about the merit of Greek poetics underpins this epigram.

Another approach to the tension between Greek and Latin poetry manifests in the first of Martial’s epigrams on Earinos, a much-beloved but unmetrically-named slave boy (*Ep.* 9.11):

Nomen cum violis rosisque natum,
 quo pars optima nominatur anni,
 Hyblam quod sapit Atticosque flores,
 quod nidos olet alitis superbae;
 nomen nectare dulcius beato,
 quo mallet Cybeles puer vocari
 et qui pocula temperat Tonanti,
 quod si Parrhasia sones in aula,
 respondent Veneres Cupidinesque;
 nomen nobile, molle, delicatum
 versu dicere non rudi volebam:
 sed tu syllaba contumax rebellas.
 dicunt Eiarinon tamen poetae,
 sed Graeci, quibus est nihil negatum
 et quos Ἄρες Ἄρες decet sonare:
 nobis non licet esse tam disertis,
 qui Musas colimus severiores.

Name born along with violets and roses, by which the best part of the year is named, which tastes of Hybla and Attic flowers, which smells of the haughty bird’s nest; name sweeter than blessed nectar, by which the son of Cybele would rather be called, and the Thunderer’s cup-mixer, which Venuses and Cupids reecho if you utter it in the Parrhasian palace; noble, gentle, tender name, I wanted to speak you in my not unrefined verse – but you rebelled, stubborn syllable. Sure, the poets say ‘Eiarinos,’ but only the Greek ones, for whom nothing is off-limits and whom it suits to sing “Ares, Ares.” We’re not allowed to be so eloquent – we honor sterner Muses.

The poem begins with a joyous commingling of Greek and Latin imagery as the taste of the addressee’s name is likened to that of Hyblan (Sicilian) and Attic honey: *Hyblam*

¹⁷⁶ Neger (2014) 342-4.

quod sapit Atticosque flores (3). But the poet's exultation in Earinos' name is soon tainted by the fact that he cannot fit it into any of his meters, at least not in its 'pure' form. Naturally, says Martial, the Greek poets can simply add an iota to the name,¹⁷⁷ but their scope for poetic license is far broader than his own (*est nihil negatum* 14) – no less a figure than Homer allowed himself to sing ἄρεσ ἄρεσ (cf. *Il.* 5.31), where each alpha has a different metrical quantity. No, Martial claims, the Roman Muses are *severiores* (17), even if this does result in a loss of eloquence (*nobis non licet esse tam disertis* 16). Here we find Martial's most explicit articulation of the idea that Roman poetry labors under a heavy burden absent from Greek poetry. Within the context of this epigram, there is no doubt some jealousy underlying the claim – "if only we Romans had the freedom of the Greeks; then we might be truly *diserti*, as they are." At the same time, though, there seems to be a hint of haughtiness in the phrase *Graeci, quibus est nihil negatum*, especially in juxtaposition with the Roman *Musae severiores* – "those Greeks will stoop to anything to become *diserti*; at least we Romans have some restraint."¹⁷⁸ The question thus becomes how seriously we should take Martial's apparent contempt for Greek poetic licentiousness.¹⁷⁹ While reading the poem as a dour piece of invective seems to run contrary to its theme and the playful spirit of the *Epigrams* more broadly, I would suggest that Martial has no qualms about opening potential attack routes against the Greeks. This again betrays an anxiety on his part (affected or otherwise) over the position that Greek

¹⁷⁷ As Asclepiades in fact does: cf. *AP* 5.169.

¹⁷⁸ Indeed, we find the language of denial (*negare*) used of Greek prostitutes elsewhere in the *Epigrams* (e.g. 4.12: *Nulli, Thai, negas, sed si te non pudet istud, / hoc saltem pudeat, Thai, negare nihil*, "There's nobody you say no to, Thais, but if you're not ashamed of that, at least be ashamed that there's *nothing* you say no to either"), but this is qualified somewhat by Martial's application of the same terminology to all women, Greek and Roman alike (cf. esp. 4.71 – *nulla puella negat* – and its companion piece 4.81, to *Fabulla*).

¹⁷⁹ Henriksen (1998) intr. n. ad loc. falls on the serious side, pairing this epigram with 9.40, which he interprets as a scathing condemnation of Greek traveling poets.

poetry occupies in relation to Latin poetry. On the one hand, Greek language and culture have become a fundamental and inextricable part of Roman literature (*Hyblam... Atticosque flores*); on the other, Martial (along with many of his Latin predecessors, for that matter) wants to assert Roman poetic superiority over the Greeks.

As we have seen throughout this section, Martial plainly acknowledges the contradictory relationship between Greek and Roman art, both physical and literary. He pits Greek against Roman, but never fails to depict the Greek as no mean opponent, which of course makes the Roman's victory all the sweeter. My next section will explore how Martial not only acknowledges this tension but actively uses it to his advantage as a self-fashioning device.

III. Martial the Bard: Homeric Epic in the *Epigrams*

In the remainder of this chapter, I will turn my attention from Martial's general comments on Greek literature to his complex engagement with one of the few specific Greek poets he mentions by name: Homer. An understanding of how Martial simultaneously elevates, denigrates, and appropriates Homer's poems and reputation will provide a useful backdrop against which to measure my analyses of Greek epigrammatists (who are *not* mentioned by name) in the upcoming chapters. Before we turn to Homeric epic specifically, however, let us first consider how Martial describes the genre more broadly, and in particular how he relates it to his own poems. Martial refers with varying levels of explicitness to the genre of epic poetry on several occasions, typically as a way of

explaining what his own epigrams are not.¹⁸⁰ One such instance is *Ep.* 4.49, in which Martial, beset by critics describing his poems as mere trifles (*lusus...iocosque* 2),¹⁸¹ responds with the assertion that the authors of hackneyed works of mythology (on Tereus, Daedalus, Polyphemus, etc.) are in fact the real triflers.¹⁸² Such grandiose themes, he argues, are little more than hot air (*vesica* 7), and while such poems may be widely known and highly praised, Martial is content to have his epigrams actually read (9-10):

'illa tamen laudant omnes, mirantur, adorant.' / confiteor: laudant illa, sed ista legunt

("But they praise those poems, they marvel at them, they worship them!" I admit it. They do praise those ones, but they read these ones").¹⁸³ He elaborates upon this argument in *Ep.* 10.4, explaining that his poems derive their appeal from their basis in reality and practical applicability (7-8): *quid te vana iuvant miserae ludibria chartae? / hoc lege, quod possit dicere vita 'meum est'* ("What good does the empty nonsense of these wretched pages [= mythological poems] do you? Read this instead – real life can say 'it's all mine'"). In both this poem and 4.49, Martial inverts the usual generic hierarchy: mythological epic becomes nugatory (*lusus, ioci, ludibria*) while epigram assumes the mantle of utility and an apparent role as social guide.¹⁸⁴ Such an inversion forces Martial's readers to question their presuppositions not only about epigram, but about myth and epic, and to view (if only for a moment) the epigrammatist as morally superior

¹⁸⁰ Although I will be arguing here that Martial's remarks on (and against) epic can reveal much about his understanding of the genre and its relationship to epigram, it is important to recall the historical context of his poems as well. As Soldevila (2006) *ad* 4.49 observes, mythological epic was extremely popular in the Flavian period, which gave Martial many immediate targets, not the least of whom (or so scholars have long suggested) was Statius. So while I intend to draw general conclusions from many of Martial's statements on epic as one way of getting at his relationship with Homer, I remain fully aware that Homer was probably not always at the forefront of his mind.

¹⁸¹ There is of course some irony to Martial's indignation, since he uses these same terms on numerous occasions to describe his own poetry. But it is one thing to deprecate oneself, and quite another to be deprecated by others.

¹⁸² Martial's contemporary Juvenal gives the same impression in his first *Satire*.

¹⁸³ The very fact that the reader is reading his epigram proves Martial's point.

¹⁸⁴ Cf. Spisak (2007): 22, which briefly discusses these two poems along similar lines. I do not, however, take Martial's argument quite as seriously as does Spisak.

to the epic poet.

Martial continues to upset his audience's generic expectations through his many comments on the length of his epigrams. He includes in his sixth book a 32-line poem in hexameters (*Ep.* 6.64), a clear challenge to the traditional conception of epigram, and in the following poem he defends this choice (*Ep.* 6.65):

‘Hexametris epigramma facis’ scio dicere Tuccam.
Tucca, solet fieri, denique, Tucca, licet.
‘sed tamen hoc longum est.’ solet hoc quoque, Tucca, licetque:
si breviora probas, disticha sola legas.
conveniat nobis ut fas epigrammata longa
sit transire tibi, scribere, Tucca, mihi.

“You made an epigram in hexameters,” says Tucca (I know it). Tucca, it’s not that unusual, and in fact, Tucca, it’s allowed. “But still, that’s a long one.” That’s not unusual either, Tucca, and it’s allowed – if you prefer shorter ones, read just the two-liners. Let’s make a deal, Tucca: it’s acceptable for you to skip the long epigrams and for me to write them.

Here, Martial skirts the long-standing debate in antiquity about the proper length of an epigram by citing a nebulous and possibly fictional form of precedent (*solet...licet*).¹⁸⁵

He concludes from this ‘evidence’ that he has the definitive and even divine right (*fas*) to write *epigrammata longa*, a claim which ultimately legitimizes epigrams of any length.

But length is relative, as Martial explains in a poem from Book 2, again responding to accusations of *epigrammata longa* (*Ep.* 2.77.7-8): *non sunt longa quibus nihil est quod demere possis, / sed tu, Cosconi, disticha longa facis* (“Things from which you can’t subtract anything aren’t long – but you, Cosconius, you make long couplets”). In other words, ‘length’ is a matter of quality, not quantity: a long poem is one filled with excess material, much like the *vesica* of mythological epic from *Ep.* 4.49.¹⁸⁶ Essentially, then,

¹⁸⁵ For an overview of the debate, see Grewing (1997) intr. n. ad loc. Unsurprisingly, there are many more arguments in favor of brevity (e.g. *AP* 9.342, 9.369).

¹⁸⁶ This approach is a far cry from the kind found in *AP* 9.369: Πάγκαλόν ἐστ’ ἐπίγραμμα τὸ δίστιχον· ἥν δὲ παρέλθῃς / τοὺς τρεῖς, ῥαψωδεῖς κοῦκ ἐπίγραμμα λέγεις (“The best epigrams are couplets. Once you pass three lines, you’re composing epic, not epigram.”)

Martial is correcting what he perceives to be the popular misconception that a poem's line count is an indicator of its quality, and in so doing he is able to position epigram on a level playing field with an imposing genre like epic, which (he suggests) by virtue of its very length should be especially subject to scrutiny.

Martial explicitly pits epigram against epic in poem 9.50, an attack on the mysterious poet Gaurus:¹⁸⁷

Ingenium mihi, Gaure, probas sic esse pusillum,
carmina quod faciam quae brevitatem placent.
confiteor. sed tu bis senis grandia libris
qui scribis Priami proelia, magnus homo es?
nos facimus Bruti puerum, nos Langona vivum:
tu magnus luteum, Gaure, Giganta facis.

You're trying to prove that my talent is insignificant, Gaurus, because I make poems that please with their brevity. You're right. But you, the guy who writes about Priam's monumental wars in twelve books, *you're* a great man? I'm making Brutus' boy-statue, or a living, breathing Langon: you, Gaurus the Great, you're making a clay Giant.¹⁸⁸

In the first half of the poem, Martial tacitly reinterprets Gaurus' insulting descriptor, *ingenium pusillum*, no doubt originally meant as "lack of talent," as something like "a trifling disposition," a characteristic that most epigrammatists, Martial included, readily admit (cf. *confiteor*) to possessing. This admission enervates Gaurus' argument, which in turn enables Martial to attack Gaurus from a dominant position in the second half of the poem. The invective focuses on Gaurus' twelve-book epic (*Priami proelia*), a work that, according to Martial, has given its author a false sense of superiority, when in reality it is a cumbersome *luteus Gigas*. Once again, Martial is suggesting that the size of a poem has little bearing on its quality, but this time he is using the principle to assert the superiority of (his) epigram to (Gaurus') epic: Martial's brief poems are intricate and

¹⁸⁷ Friedländer's suggestion that Gaurus is an allusion to Statius has won widespread acceptance (cf. Henriksen (1999) ad loc.), but the poet's identity should not significantly affect my present argument.

¹⁸⁸ The *Bruti puer* was evidently a favorite statuette of Brutus the Tyrannicide. The identity of the *Langon* is uncertain.

lifelike compositions, while Gaurus has created a mythical monstrosity in twelve books, subject to collapse at any moment. This emphasis on realism (*Langona vivum*) anticipates Martial's 'programmatic' statement from Book 10, which we have already looked at above: *hoc lege, quod possit dicere vita 'meum est.'*¹⁸⁹ While Martial does not mention Homer or Greek epic in this or any of the above poems, the points he makes nevertheless serve to destabilize the audience's presuppositions about how to define epigram, epic, and, more generally, good poetry, whether Greek or Latin. It is necessary to keep this destabilization in mind as we turn now to some epigrams that engage more directly with Homeric epic.

Explicit mention of Homer in Martial's *Epigrams* is very rare, and there are only three occurrences of the proper name *Homerus*, all in the *Apophoreta*.¹⁹⁰ These are worth some brief attention, as it is striking that the name of a poet who wrote nearly thirty thousand lines of Greek appears only in a collection of two-line poems.¹⁹¹ The first instance pairs Homer with Vergil (*Ep.* 14.57):

Myrobalanum
Quod nec Vergilius nec carmine dicit Homerus,
hoc ex unguento constat et ex balano.

Ben nut

Neither Vergil nor Homer mentioned this in their poems: it consists of oil and a nut.

¹⁸⁹ Martial makes much of this idea that his poems are grounded in real life (cf. also the ninth's Muse's address to the poet at 8.3.19-20: *at tu Romano lepidos sale tinge libellos:/ agnoscat mores vita legatque suos*, "season your witty little books with salt – let life recognize and read about her morals"), but earlier in his career he is equally conscious of establishing a divide between life and the *Epigrams*, lest he find trouble (e.g. 1.4.8: *lasciva est nobis pagina, vita proba*, "my page is impudent, my life honest"; 3.99.2: *ars tua, non vita est carmine laesa meo*, "my poem has wounded your craft, not your lifestyle"). It is possible that his confidence increases as his work finds success, but cf. 10.33.10, in the wake of Domitian's assassination: *parcere personis, dicere de vitiis*, "[my poems] spare individuals, but talk about vices."

¹⁹⁰ 14.57, 14.183, 14.184. Martial refers to Homer as *Maeonides* at 5.10 and uses the adjective *Maeonius* at 7.46 (as well as in 14.183).

¹⁹¹ It is equally striking that Martial's references to Vergil in the *Apophoreta* exactly parallel his references to Homer – Vergil and Homer both appear in 14.57, while 14.183 and 184 on Homer are succeeded by 14.185 and 186 on Vergil. But Martial has no qualms about mentioning Vergil by name elsewhere in the *Epigrams* and does so more than a dozen times.

This poem, ostensibly attached to a *myrobalanum*, an exotic oil-bearing nut,¹⁹² matter-of-factly points out a deficiency in the two great representatives of Greek and Latin epic: the absence of the word *myrobalanum*, which is unmetrical. In some sense this is a boast on Martial's part, since he has managed to incorporate the *myrobalanum*, or at least its description, into a single two-line epigram when neither of the two great epic poets were able to do so anywhere in their massive oeuvres. Homer perhaps suffers more from the observation, since *myrobalanum* is a Greek derivative, from μύρον (oil) and βάλανος (acorn).¹⁹³ At the same time, of course, Martial is no more capable of putting the word into his meter than Homer or Vergil, and so he must use it extrametricaly as a label for this poem. In the verse itself, he resorts to a periphrastic calque (*ex unguento constat et ex balano*), which is clever, but not quite the emphatic embarrassment of Homer and Vergil that Martial might like his readers to infer.

The next (and last) two references to Homer in the *Apophoreta* more convincingly cut him down to Martial's size. The first accompanies a copy of the *Batrachomyomachia*, the comic work attributed in antiquity to Homer (*Ep.* 14.183):

Homeri Batrachomyomachia
Perlege Maeonio cantatas carmine ranas
et frontem nugis solvere disce meis.

Read through the frogs sung in Maeonian song and learn how to relax your brow with *my* trifles.¹⁹⁴

The self-fashioning aims of this poem are transparent: if even the great Homer deigned to sing of frogs and mice, surely Martial can write lighthearted poetry of his own. In other words, Martial is using the most nugatory Homeric text available to justify the existence

¹⁹² Specifically the fruit of the *Moringa oleifera*, a tree native to Asia and Africa. Cf. Leary (1996) ad loc. For further botanical information, see S. Holst (2011) *Moringa: Nature's Miracle Tree*. Los Angeles.

¹⁹³ μύρον does not appear in Homer, but βάλανος occurs twice in the *Odyssey* (10.242 and 13.409). Vergil, meanwhile, uses neither *balanus* nor *unguentum*, Martial's gloss of μύρον, anywhere in his corpus.

¹⁹⁴ The translation is adapted from Shackleton Bailey's, the italics are my own.

of the *Epigrams*. Certainly this justification constitutes an admission of the immense literary influence Homer could exert on any genre of poetry, but at the same time Martial is revealing to his audience that he and Homer are not so different after all, a revelation which simultaneously elevates Martial's poetic status and debases Homer's. We encounter something similar in the subsequent epigram (*Ep.* 14.184):

Homerus in pugillaribus membraneis
Ilias et Priami regnis inimicus Ulixes
multiplici pariter condita pelle latent.

Homer in a codex

The *Iliad* and Ulysses, enemy of Priam's kingdom, both lurk hidden amidst parchment of many twists and turns.

Only here does Martial directly refer to Homer's epic compositions, and it is telling that they are compressed into a single couplet, which itself describes how the two epics are compressed into a single codex.¹⁹⁵ Luke Roman helpfully explains this epigrammatic compression: "Homer [does] indeed form part of Martial's text, but the complex texture of meaning of these classic works has been reduced to the compass of a gift tag, set alongside distichs about monkeys and lapdogs."¹⁹⁶ Meanwhile, Martial has in this same poem appropriated Homeric language, as the adjective *multiplex* seems a fairly obvious allusion to Homer's πολύτροπος Odysseus.¹⁹⁷ Once again we find Martial conferring a bit of epic grandeur upon himself even as he reduces Homer to epigrammatic size.

I will turn now from Homer's appearances in the *Apophoreta* to some of the less explicit ways he surfaces elsewhere in the *Epigrams*. I will begin by discussing two

¹⁹⁵ He gives the same treatment to Vergil (14.186), Livy (14.190), and Ovid (14.192), but no other Greek author.

¹⁹⁶ L. Roman (2001) 135.

¹⁹⁷ There is an interesting parallel here with Livius Andronicus' gloss of πολύτροπος as *versutus* (on which see Hinds (1998) 58-62). Hypothetically, Martial might be engaging in some intertextual linguistic play: if we take the phrase *multiplex pellis* and swap out Martial's gloss for Livius', the resulting *versuta pellis* might remind the reader of the adjective *versipellis*, which is itself a new gloss for πολύτροπος (cf. L&S s.v. *versipellis* II for the common meaning 'skilled in dissimulation, crafty, cunning'; the meaning 'shape-changer' or 'werewolf' is perhaps best reserved for Proteus in the *Iliad*).

epigrams from Book 1 in which Martial uses specifically Homeric language for comic effect.¹⁹⁸ Each of these comprises just a single couplet. The first occurs about halfway through the book (*Ep.* 1.45): *edita ne brevibus pereat mihi cura libellis, / dicatur potius τὸν δ' ἀπαμειβόμενος* (“Just so that my work doesn’t perish because it’s published in short little books, I’d better start saying ‘and to him in response...’”). Historically, scholars have read this poem either as a jab (more or less polemical) against critics of brevity, who unfairly threaten the survival of Martial’s work,¹⁹⁹ or as an *apologia* for Martial’s own thematic repetition throughout Book 1.²⁰⁰ On my reading, the poem seems to emphasize the merits of brevity over those of repetition, but not to attack critics or as a self-defense, as we saw, for instance, in poems 6.65 (on Martial’s hexameters) and 9.50 (against Gaurus); rather, Martial is inviting a favorable comparison between his own poetry and Homer’s. Martial has devised a comical plan to start using Homer’s oft-repeated phrase τὸν δ' ἀπαμειβόμενος in order to augment his poetry artificially. Most literally, this would entail the physical lengthening of any given poem by the addition of seven extra syllables,²⁰¹ but the appearance of Homeric language might also augment an epigram metaphorically by grafting onto it an example of ‘epic gravity.’ On the latter point, we should also consider the usual context for Homer’s use of τὸν δ' ἀπαμειβόμενος,²⁰² a phrase that often precedes a lengthy response to an earlier speech.

¹⁹⁸ Wordplay with Homeric language also occurs at *Ep.* 7.57 and 9.94.

¹⁹⁹ Friedländer goes so far as to punctuate the last line with a question mark, envisioning the poem as an attack on Martial’s critics.

²⁰⁰ Especially considering the poem immediately preceding this one (*Ep.* 1.44), in which Martial proudly admits to his repetition of the recurring lion/hare motif (*bis idem facimus*). Cf. Citroni (1975) intr. n. ad loc., which provides a good overview of past scholarship on the *apologia* interpretation. Citroni’s own view is that Martial is forestalling potential objections to past (and future) repetitions by citing Homeric precedent. This argument implies a less complicated relationship between Martial and Homer than I am willing to concede, as I will discuss below.

²⁰¹ Sadly, Martial does not share with the reader how exactly this process would work, and so we are left to speculate in vain about how things like meter and sense would come into play.

²⁰² A TLG search of the phrase yields 69 total occurrences, 25 in the *Iliad* and 44 in the *Odyssey*. This count excludes

Were Martial to attach this particular phrase to any given epigram, then, that poem's metaphorical enlargement might result not only from the 'weight' of epic grandeur but also from the promise of a long response – this one phrase carries with it a great many more lines. But why would Martial need to augment his poems in the first place? Over the course of the *Epigrams*, and as early as his first book, Martial adopts a self-assured stance regarding his posthumous fame, which makes this poem's chicanery look all the more unnecessary – and ridiculous.²⁰³ Moreover, as I discussed in depth at the beginning of this section, he frequently insists that his epigrams are exactly as long as they need to be, and that they even benefit from lack of epic bombast. On the issue of thematic repetition, Martial is playfully unapologetic, as the epigram immediately preceding this one makes evident (*Ep.* 1.44.3-4): *nimum si, Stella, videtur / hoc tibi, bis leporem tu quoque pone mihi*. In light of such seemingly confident statements of poetics, it is unsatisfying to read poem 1.45 as a simple response (whether aggressive or defensive) to anonymous critics.

The key to reading the poem, I believe, is to make more of Homer's presence – rare enough in the *Epigrams*, and rarer still in the form of a Greek quotation – than have previous scholars, who tend to cast him as an inert stand-in for poetic repetition. I would argue instead that Martial is purposefully poking fun at Homer by way of inviting his readers to compare one poet with the other, a comparison which, because it takes place on

the feminine version τὴν δ' ἀπαμειβόμενος.

²⁰³ In Book 1, see e.g. 1.88, where Martial promises his deceased slave immortality through verse (line 8: *hic tibi perpetuo tempore vivet honor*). I do not, however, mean to suggest that Martial is concerned only with the future, given that he frequently expresses a preference for present fame (cf. e.g. 5.10.12: *si post fata venit gloria, non propero*). The complexity of this tension is best encapsulated by Roman (2001) 116: "On the one hand, Martial echoes the language of earlier poets, such as Catullus, Propertius, Ovid, and Horace, in his claims to poetic immortality. On the other hand, he also engages in a more equivocal mode of self-representation in poems that express a preference for literary fame during one's own lifetime, as distinguished from posthumous reputation, which comes too late to be enjoyed."

Martial's generic turf, the epigrammatist is bound to win. Further, in suggesting that a Homeric formula can be used as pure artifice, Martial seems to insinuate that Homer himself used formulae for the same reasons – either to increase his word count, or to lend illusory weight to his narrative through repetition. Although it is improbable that Martial actually believes these to be Homer's true motivations, it would be hasty to dismiss the poem as purely facetious. Much to the dismay of Martial the epigrammatist, long poems, especially epics, have a tendency to survive, even if (in his view) they owe their length to incessant repetition.²⁰⁴ And so he once again implies self-servingly that a poem's length should not and ultimately cannot add to its value, making this point here at the expense of Homer, the lengthy poet *par excellence*. The effect is to drag a bloated Homer into the slender literary world of epigram, where – ironically due to his very size – he cannot measure up to Martial.²⁰⁵

The next instance of Homeric wordplay appears only a few poems later (*Ep.* 1.50): *si tibi Mistyllos cocus, Aemiliane, vocatur, / dicatur quare non Taratalla mihi?* (“If your cook is named Mistyllos, Aemilianus, why not call mine Taratalla?”). Aemilianus has cleverly named his cook Mistyllos after the Greek verb μιστύλλω meaning ‘to butcher.’ The name reminds Martial of Homer's formulaic line μίστυλλον τ' ἄρα τᾶλλα καὶ ἄμφ' ὀβελοῖσιν ἔπειραν (“they cut up the rest and pierced it on spits”), and he takes the opportunity to make a joke: if Aemilianus' cook is called Mistyllos (μίστυλλον), why not call his own Taratalla (τ' ἄρα τᾶλλα)? The pun is simple enough, but for it to work, the

²⁰⁴ Whether or not this is true is, for Martial, beside the point.

²⁰⁵ Fitzgerald (2007) 167-90 helpfully describes this process as “banalization” and illustrates it with Martial's simultaneously respectful and irreverent reworkings of Catullus and Ovid. The effect, he argues, is that Martial one-ups his predecessors by recontextualizing or intentionally misreading their poems within his own epigrams. As I have argued, he is doing much the same thing with Homeric epic, and this will become even more apparent below.

reader must have an intimate familiarity with Homer's poems, to the extent of being able to recognize the Latinized names Mistyllos and Taratalla as allusions to a relatively uncommon Greek formula.²⁰⁶ By assuming that his audience (or at least some of his audience) will get the joke, Martial implicitly reinforces Homer's status as a cornerstone of Roman education, fit to be memorized.²⁰⁷ Martial might even be appropriating some of this Homeric prestige for himself, given that his name-based puns recall Homer's own affinity for 'speaking' names and frequent juxtaposition of proper names with etymologically similar words (as, for example, Ὀδυσσεύς and ὀδύσσομαι).²⁰⁸ But any prestige that Homer might lend Martial is certainly not mutual; rather, Martial applies Homeric language and technique to the most humble of contexts, Roman slave nomenclature, once again cutting Homer down to size.²⁰⁹

In the remainder of this section I will consider some other ways in which Martial profitably demythologizes Homer, namely through the frequent deployment of characters made famous by Homeric epic. Insofar as referring to characters without clear reference to their Homeric origins is a more allusive practice than the comparatively obvious textual references I have just discussed, it will be useful here briefly to situate Martial within a broader poetic context. Roman poets (to say nothing of Greek ones) were of course constantly evaluating Homer's literary, practical, and moral relevance long before Martial: Horace, for example, explicitly articulates this urge in his second *Epistle*, where

²⁰⁶ The line appears five times (*Il.* 1.465, 2.428; *Od.* 3.462, 12.365, 14.430). Cf. Citroni (1975) ad loc.

²⁰⁷ Cf. e.g. Quintilian *IO* 10.1.46 ([Homerus] *omnibus eloquentiae partibus exemplum et ortum dedit*, "Homer provides the model and starting-point for all forms of eloquence"). For a recent treatment, see T. Morgan (1999) *Literate Education in the Hellenistic and Roman Worlds*. Cambridge: 90-119.

²⁰⁸ B. Louden (1995) "Categories of Homeric wordplay" *TAPA* 125: 27-46 offers a breakdown of some the most common types of Homeric wordplay.

²⁰⁹ While the immediate context of the Homeric formula (the preparing of food) is also fairly mundane, there is a stark social difference: in Homer, Greek heroes are doing the preparation; in Martial, Greek slaves (in Rome, no less).

the narrator reads the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* with a moralizing eye, and a more critical manifestation of the phenomenon can be detected in Ovid's frequently irreverent deconstructions of Homeric epic, several of which I will discuss below.²¹⁰ Indeed, any of Martial's Augustan predecessors might offer a prism through which his 'Homer' might be refracted. The tendency to defictionalize, dissect, or exploit Homer is equally present in Martial's Flavian contemporaries, whose readings of and allusions to the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* are inevitably filtered through those of earlier Roman poets, and who often invoke Homer in ways that call attention to his status as both predecessor and rival.²¹¹

Martial fits into this general trend, although the multivalent persona he adopts as an author of epigram gives a unique nuance to the phenomenon. In keeping with his avowed focus on reality, Martial always refers to Homeric characters, the majority from the *Odyssey*, in terms of how they relate to some real person or situation. As a key component of this process, he reduces many figures to type (Nestor, for instance, becomes synonymous with old age),²¹² and then returns to these types repeatedly over the course of the *Epigrams*. As I will discuss below, this hyper-distilled use of Homeric characters is nothing new in the Latin poetic tradition, but Martial's application of the practice is persistent enough to warrant special attention. At times, these characters, the

²¹⁰ Hor. Ep. 1.2.1-4: *Troiani belli scriptorem... / Praeneste relegi, / qui quid sit pulchrum, quid turpe, quid utile, quid non, / plenius ac melius Chrysippo et Crantore dicit* ("At Praeneste I've been rereading the Trojan war's author, who describes better and more fully than Chrysippus or Crantor what's noble, what's foul, what's useful, what isn't...").

²¹¹ Particularly informative on this topic is the recent collection *Flavian Poetry and its Greek Past* (2014) A. Augustakis (ed.) Boston. See esp. P. Sfyroeras, "Like purple on ivory: A Homeric simile in Statius' *Achilleid*" 235-48, and E. Karakasis, "Homeric receptions in Flavian epic: Intertextual characterization in *Punica* 7" 251-66. On the Greek side of things, Lawrence Kim subtly frames imperial Greek poets' response(s) to the 'historicizing' trend in way that is helpful for understanding Roman poets as well. He treats three authors (Lucian, Dio Chrysostom, and Philostratus), all of whom "assert the power of fiction over history, but fiction that knows it is fiction, that far from passing itself off as the truth, lays bare its invented and constructed nature." L. Kim (2010) *Homer between History and Fiction in Imperial Greek Literature*. Cambridge: 220.

²¹² E.g. 2.64, 5.58, 7.96, 10.67. The association is so strong that by poem 10.24 the noun *Nestor* is used metonymically for a long span of time: *post hunc Nestora nec diem rogabo*.

most conspicuous of whom is Alcinous, serve encomiastic ends. The most common reference to the Phaeacian books of the *Odyssey* in the *Epigrams* is the evocation of Alcinous' legendary gardens, which appear throughout the Latin poetic tradition as the paradigm of lusciousness and bounty.²¹³ In Martial's case, the gardens usually arise in order to facilitate a favorable comparison with a person, directly or indirectly.²¹⁴ Poem 12.31, for example, a glowing description of the villa given to Martial by his patroness Marcella upon his return to Spain, concludes emphatically (9-10): *si mihi Nausicaa patrios concederet hortos, / Alcinoos possem dicere 'malo meos'* ("if Nausicaa granted me her father's gardens, I'd be able to tell Alcinous, 'I prefer my own'"). Likewise, on a friend's urban greenhouse (*Ep.* 8.68.1-2): *qui Corcyraei vidit pomaria regis, / rus, Entelle, tuae praeferet ille domus* ("a man who has beheld the Corcyrian king's orchards will prefer the countryside in your home, Entellus"). Christian Schöffel detects motivations in this poem beyond mere flattery, especially in light of an epigram earlier in the book condemning the owner of a similar greenhouse for his lack of hospitality (*Ep.* 8.14.7-8: *sic habitare iubes veterem crudelis amicum? / arboris ergo tuae tutior hospes ero*, "cruel man, this is how you bid an old friend to stay? I'll take my chances as the guest of your garden – it's safer"). Schöffel suggests that poem 8.68 makes the subtle hint that Entellus not follow the earlier host's example. Rather, he should take after the emblematically generous Alcinous (and presumably shower Martial with gifts) – after all,

²¹³ E.g. Prop. 1.14.23-4 (*quae mihi dum placata aderit, non ulla verebor / regna vel Alcinoi munera despicere*); Ov. Am. 1.10.56 [on demanding gifts] (*praebeat Alcinoi poma benignus ager*); Stat. Silv. 1.3.81-2 [on Vopiscus' villa] (*quid bifera Alcinoi laudem pomaria vosque, / qui numquam vacui prodistis in aethera, rami?*); Juv. 5.149-51 [on dinner inequality] (*Virro sibi et reliquis Virronibus illa iubebit / poma dari, quorum solo pascaris odore, qualia perpetuus Phaeacum autumnus habebat...*).

²¹⁴ V. Cristóbal (1994) "Algunos testimonios más sobre Ulises y la Odisea en la literatura latina" *Cuadernos de Filología Clásica - Estudios Latinos* 7: 57-74, esp. 67f.

he already has superior gardens.²¹⁵

This kind of non-reciprocal relationship takes center stage in another epigram making reference to Alcinoos (*Ep.* 7.42):

Muneribus cupiat si quis contendere tecum,
audeat hic etiam, Castrice, carminibus.
nos tenues in utroque sumus vincique parati:
inde sopor nobis et placet alta quies.
tam mala cur igitur dederim tibi carmina quaeris?
Alcinoos nullum poma dedisse putas?

If anyone wishes to compete with you in gifts, Castricus, let him dare to do so in poems as well. I, meager as I am on both counts, am ready to be defeated – hence I’m content with rest and deep sleep. Why, then, have I sent you such terrible poems, you ask? Do you think nobody ever gave fruit to Alcinoos?

The poet effectively abjects himself before his apparent patron Castricus, for whom he is no match when it comes to *muneribus/carminibus contendere*. Despite this discrepancy, however, Martial has sent *carmina* to Castricus (by way of career advancement, no doubt), and so he feels that he must justify their comparatively poor quality.²¹⁶ The justification takes the form of a set expression about Alcinoos, and a fairly clear allusion to Ovid’s *Epistulae Ex Ponto*, where Ovid, writing to fellow poet Cornelius Severus, explains why he has *not* included poems among his correspondence (*Pont.* 4.2.9-10): *[carmina] non data sunt: quid enim quae facis ipse darem? / quis mel Aristaeo, quis Baccho vina Falerna, / Triptolemo fruges, poma det Alcinoos?* (“I haven’t given you poems – after all, why would I give you what you yourself produce? Who would give honey to Aristaeus, or Falernian wine to Bacchus, or crops to Triptolemus, or fruit to Alcinoos?”). Why bother, asks Ovid, sending more poems to someone who has plenty of good ones already? Martial’s response to the Ovidian scenario is contrarian: the narrator not only sends Castricus his poems, but he readily admits that these poems are in fact

²¹⁵ Schöffel (2002) intr. n. ad loc. on Entellus as “neuzeitlichen Alkinoos.”

²¹⁶ Cf. Galán Vioque (2002) intr. n. ad loc.

much *worse* than the ones Castricus has already, and then he uses Ovid's Alcinous analogy to justify the very point Ovid is arguing against, that surely such an exchange is appropriate, even if it is not fair. The effect of the Ovidian allusion, then, is to call attention to Martial's mercantile audacity within an unequal power relationship, and given the epigram's literary context, we might venture a metapoetic reading: Martial is more than willing to vie with his predecessors, both Latin (evoked by the reference to Ovid) and Greek (evoked by the reference to Homer).

Another eulogistic epigram, ostensibly praising the raconteur Canius,²¹⁷ also recalls a famous scene from the *Odyssey*, but with more ambiguous results (*Ep.* 3.64):

Sirenas hilarem navigantium poenam
blandasque mortes gaudiumque crudele,
quas nemo quondam deserebat auditas,
fallax Ulixes dicitur reliquisse.
non miror: illud, Cassiane, mirarer,
si fabulantem Canium reliquisset.

The Sirens, sailors' delightful punishment, alluring doom, cruel pleasure, from whom no man on hearing them had ever departed, deceptive Ulysses left, or so they say. I'm not surprised. What *would* surprise me, Cassianus, would be if he left Canius in the middle of a story.

If taken at face value, this poem offers glowing praise of Canius' ability to tell a good story. His skill surpasses the mythical: he so entrances his listeners that even Odysseus would be unable to tear himself away.²¹⁸ This mode of panegyric seems to have had some epigrammatic precedent, as attested by a surviving couplet from the *poeta novus* Furius Bibaculus (Suet. *Gram. et Rhet.* 11.2): *Cato grammaticus, Latina Siren,/ qui solus legit ac facit poetas* ("Cato the Grammarian, the Latin Siren, who alone reads and makes

²¹⁷ Perhaps the same Canius (Rufus) as in the Theophila poem above.

²¹⁸ Cf. Cristóbal (1994) 68: De modo que en el epigrama se constata cómo lo real sobrepasa a lo mítico, cómo el modelo legendario se queda atrás, o dicho de modo más proverbial, cómo «la realidad supera a la ficción». ("The result is that in this epigram it becomes apparent how the real surpasses the mythical, how far the legendary lags behind, or more proverbially, how 'truth is stranger than fiction'").

poets”).²¹⁹ Despite this possible antecedent, however, it is naive to take any of Martial’s *Epigrams* at face value, and so the Homeric metaphor deserves further scrutiny. The alignment of Canius with legendary monsters known for luring adventurers to their deaths should give us some pause. Vicente Cristóbal suggests a potential invective reading of the poem whereby Canius is in fact the villain of the piece: perhaps, Cristóbal argues, he is a chronic windbag from whom, once he gets going, no one, not even Odysseus, could escape.²²⁰ I would argue that Martial leaves both interpretations, panegyric and invective, intentionally up to the reader, not only to maintain a semblance of plausible deniability should Canius (whoever that may be) take offense to the poem, but also to discourage one-sided readings of the *Odyssey*: just as Canius might be construed in this poem as either hero or villain, the same might be said of Homer’s Odysseus, whom Martial suggestively describes here as *fallax Ulixes*.²²¹ We must be careful not to press this argument too far – after all, Martial has assigned Canius the role of Siren, not that of Odysseus, and the Sirens are much less easily redeemed than Odysseus is vilified. Even so, by disrupting traditional interpretations of the privileged Homeric hero, Martial may be tacitly encouraging his readers to question the privileged literary status of Homeric epic, a tactic which, as I have suggested, plays in the favor of less lofty genres like epigram.

Martial casts certain characters from the *Odyssey* in more straightforwardly invective

²¹⁹ Cited by Fusi (2006) ad loc.

²²⁰ Cristóbal (1994) 69. This reading is complicated somewhat if we imagine that this Canius is the same as the one from the Theophila poem. But even should this be the case, there is nothing to stop Martial from poking fun at a friend’s foibles.

²²¹ The popular Roman characterization of Ulysses as a knave has long been noticed, especially in the context of the *Aeneid*. For recent discussion, see e.g. R.T. Ganiban (2008) “The *dolus* and glory of Ulysses in *Aeneid* 2” *MD* 61: 57-70.

contexts, as well. The beggar Irus, famed for his fight with the disguised Odysseus in Book 18, functions in the *Epigrams* as a bare paradigm for extreme poverty, always used to some real person's disadvantage.²²² Poem 5.39, for instance, is addressed to Charinus, whose incessant revisions of his will have driven the legacy-hunting narrator into the poorhouse. Irus factors into the punchline as one extreme of the spectrum of wealth (*Ep.* 5.39.8-10): *Croeso divitior licet fuisset, / Iro pauperior forem, Charine, / si conchem totiens meam comisses* ("let's say I'd started out richer than Croesus: I would still be poorer than Irus now, even if you'd been gobbling down my porridge as often [*sc.* as the expensive cakes I've been sending you]"). Likewise, in poem 6.77, Martial ridicules the young and hale Afer for being carried around on an elaborate litter in order to mask his poverty (6.77.1): *cum sis tam pauper quam nec miserabilis Irus...* ("Even though you're as poor as wretched Irus..."). Poem 12.32, a prolonged and ruthless mockery of a certain Vacerra, who has been forced to parade his run-down belongings through the streets of Rome after being evicted, describes its target in by now familiar terms (12.32.7-9): *has tu priores frigore et fame siccus / et non recenti pallidus magis buxo / Irus tuorum temporum sequebaris* ("and you followed behind them [his wife, mother, and sister], withered with cold and hunger, paler than old boxwood, the Irus of your times"). It seems clear, then, that Martial's use of Irus is relatively uncomplicated: he has taken a Homeric villain, the archetype of a particular undesirable quality, and then used that villain as a device with which to mock specific targets, in some cases for the same quality

²²² The *Odyssey* itself reviles Irus not so much for being a beggar (πρωχός 18.1) as for being greedy (γαστέρι μάργη 2), jealous (ἀλλοτρίων φθονέειν 18), and wrathful (χολωσάμενος 25), but in Latin poetry he had become synonymous with poverty well before Martial, often in conjunction with Croesus as the type of wealth, a device picked up by Martial in *Ep.* 5.39 (cf. e.g. Prop. 3.5.17: *Lydus Dulichio non distat Croesus ab Iro*, "Lydian Croesus is not that different from Dulichian Irus"; Ov. *Tr.* 3.7.42: *Irus et est subito, qui modo Croesus erat*, "and all of a sudden he who was once a Croesus became an Irus"). See Canobbio (2011b) ad 5.39.9.

(poverty, as in 12.32), but in some cases for other – presumably worse – qualities (as in 6.77, where Afer’s ostentatious hypocrisy is the problem, or in 5.39, where Charinus’ fickleness and greed have driven the poet himself to poverty, which in this case is to be pitied).

Mocking a target by alluding to a villain (who is himself mocked in the *Odyssey*) is a relatively unadventurous invective device. More striking, however, is Martial’s use of the indisputably tragic figure Elpenor in his eleventh book (*Ep.* 11.82):²²³

A Sinuessanis conviva Philostratus undis
 conductum repetens nocte iubente larem
 paene imitatus obit saevis Elpenora fati,
 praeceps per longos dum ruit usque gradus.
 non esset, Nymphae, tam magna pericula passus,
 si potius vestras ille bibisset aquas.

Philostratus, a dinner guest coming from the Sinuessan baths, was heading home to his rented apartment (the hour was late) when he nearly took after Elpenor and met a cruel end: he tumbled headfirst down a long flight of stairs. He wouldn’t have gone through such a dangerous situation, Nymphs, if he had just imbibed your waters instead.

The ‘invective’ here is somewhat milder than we have seen in the previous three poems – Martial, playing the advocate of sobriety, is making fun of Philostratus’²²⁴ overindulgence in wine on a particular occasion, although Philostratus has already learned his lesson the hard way. The epigram is more a joke than anything else, and so perhaps the image of an antagonist like Irus would not accord with such a playful theme. Nevertheless, Martial’s choice of Elpenor seems somewhat peculiar, in that it makes light of a poignant and

²²³ Elpenor, to the extent that he appears at all in the Latin poetic tradition, is generally a pitiable character. Convincing arguments have been made about his influence on the equally pitiable Palinurus in the *Aeneid* (e.g. M. Lossau (1980) “Elpenor und Palinurus” *WS* 14: 102-24; I. Ciccarelli (2005) “I modelli del Palinuro virgiliano” *BStudLat* 35: 479-94), and Ovid refers to him outright as *miser Elpenor* (*Tr.* 3.4.19). But elsewhere Ovid offers some interesting possible exceptions to this general rule in the *Met.* and the *Ibis*, which I will discuss below.

²²⁴ His name is itself a likely bilingual pun: traditionally, of course, it is derived from the Greek φίλος and στρατός, but a Latin-speaking audience might easily read φίλος + *stratus* (“prone to ending up on his back”), given the theme of this poem.

religiously-charged scene from the *Odyssey*,²²⁵ effectively reducing the story of a man who desperately seeks burial after accidentally falling to his death to an anecdote about a man who drank too much and paid the price. Once again, Ovid might offer an informative precedent, this time in the *Ibis*, where the poet puts Elpenor, along with a great many other Homeric characters, to aggressive invective use (*Ib.* 485-6):²²⁶ *neve gradus adeas Elpenore cautius altos, / vimque feras vini quo tulit ille modo* (“and may you approach tall steps no more cautiously than did Elpenor, and suffer the power of wine just as he suffered it”). Martial may well have read Ovid’s treatment of the Elpenor myth as irreverent, and then seized upon this idea for poem 11.82, where he tones down the aggression and instead ramps up the irreverence.²²⁷ This kind of epigram gives Martial a degree of literary power over Homer, as he has effectively compelled his audience to reread part of the *Odyssey* from a real-life Roman perspective: Elpenor, like Philostratus, was just a *conviva madidus* who had an accident, which would have been funny if it hadn’t been fatal.²²⁸ Once again, Martial has appropriated Homeric myth for his own ends.

The most striking manifestation of this phenomenon is Martial’s blatant sexualization of several Homeric characters, mainly women. As early as Book 1 we find a suggestive ending to a poem on Laevina, a dour Roman matron who has developed a habit for luxury bathing (*Ep.* 1.62.5-6): *incidit in flammis: iuvenemque secuta relicto / coniuge Penelope venit, abit Helene* (“she fell into the fire: she left her husband and

²²⁵ *Od.* 11.51-89.

²²⁶ Whether Ovid models this usage on the Callimachean *Ibis* is sadly impossible to determine. Elpenor’s presence in other Greek poetry (besides the *Odyssey*) is practically nonexistent.

²²⁷ To be fair, this is not necessarily surprising in a book devoted to the Saturnalia.

²²⁸ This is not to say that Elpenor did not have an association with overindulgence – he admits as much himself (*Od.* 11.61: ἄθῆσφατος οἶνος), and Ovid (again) makes the same connection (*Met.* 14.252: *nimique Elpenora vini*).

chased after a younger man – she showed up as Penelope but left as Helen”). As with the male examples I have already discussed, here Martial’s Homeric characters represent specific personal qualities: Penelope is the type of marital fidelity, Helen that of infidelity. Citroni points out in his discussion of this poem the spatial economy (much desired in epigram) that Martial affords himself by using names to invoke complex concepts.²²⁹ This is especially true here, as the respective stories of Penelope and Helen succinctly and wittily capture the essence of Laelia’s moral transformation as Martial describes it in the preceding lines. But Martial’s engagement with Homer runs deeper than mere convenience. Most striking is the low context into which he brings these Homeric women: Penelope, wife of Odysseus, and Helen, the cause of the Trojan war, have been reduced to mere comparanda for a contemporary Roman woman whose resort-hopping lifestyle has led her to cheat on her husband.²³⁰

Martial carries this degradation a step further in Book 3, where he uses two Homeric women to elucidate a man’s unusual sexual preferences. The poet is dumbfounded at a certain Bassus’ attraction to old women rather than girls (*Ep.* 3.76.3-4):²³¹ *hic, rogo, non furor est, non haec est mentula demens? / cum possis Hecaben, non potes Andromachen* (“I ask you, is this not insanity? Is this not a cockeyed cock?”²³² You could do Hecuba, but you couldn’t do Andromache?”). Just as with the last poem, here Martial neatly sums up his main point by referring to two Homeric women who represent opposing qualities:

²²⁹ Citroni (1975) ad loc.

²³⁰ Citroni calls this phenomenon “una scherzosa ironia” (“a playful irony”), Cristóbal calls it “desmitificación” (“demystification”). While these are certainly accurate, Fitzgerald’s term “banalization” strikes me as most apt.

²³¹ For detailed commentary on this poem, cf. Watson and Watson (2003) 221-2 and Fusi (2006).

²³² The pun on *demens* (“out of one’s mind”) and *mentula* (lit. “little mind”) is untranslatable, but I have done my best to approximate the sense while retaining the wordplay.

Hecuba is essentially a synonym for ‘old crone,’ Andromache for ‘appealing youth.’²³³ These associations were not uncommon in antiquity – a similar dichotomy appears, for instance, in a Greek epigram attributed to Martial’s near-contemporary Lucillius (*AP* 11.408.5-6: οὔποτε φῦκος / καὶ ψίμυθος τεύξει τὴν Ἑκάβην Ἑλένην, “blush and powder will never make a Helen out of Hecuba”) – but remarkable in Martial’s case is the stark sexual context into which he places the two epic heroines. Two obscenities occur in the four line poem, *arrigis* (the first word, not quoted here) and *mentula* (3), but note also the conspicuous omission of the verb *futuere* in the final verse, perhaps a disingenuous (and amusing) effort to maintain decorum in the presence of esteemed women. As with Penelope and Helen in Book 1, by invoking Hecuba and Andromache within an obscene mockery of a man’s sexual perversity, Martial compels his reader to think about these women in a new and unabashedly realistic light. This poem in particular carries the depravation of Homeric epic to another level by transforming two of his female characters into blatant sexual objects.²³⁴ This is not, however, to suggest that the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* are asexual poems; on the contrary, as Marilyn Skinner observes, the *Iliad* is basically a poem about “illicit sexuality,” while the *Odyssey* narrates the consequences of female sexual desire and the ability or inability to control it.²³⁵ Rather, Martial exposes this latent sexuality, then brings it to its ‘natural’ conclusion: all women in Homer, even the so-called virtuous ones, are sexual creatures.

This process of throwing back the curtain on the sexuality of Homeric women comes to a crescendo in Book 11, where Penelope and Andromache appear once again, but in

²³³ Cf. also *Ep.* 3.32 and 10.90.

²³⁴ Quite literally, as *Hecabēn* and *Andromachēn* are both direct objects of the implied *futuere*.

²³⁵ M. Skinner (2005) *Sexuality in Greek and Roman Culture*. Oxford: 32-42.

much less allusive terms. The narrator is citing epic precedent in an effort to convince his wife to be less frigid (*Ep.* 11.104.13-6):

masturbabantur Phrygii post ostia servi,
Hectoreo quotiens sederat uxor equo,
et quamvis Ithaco stertente pudica solebat
illic Penelope semper habere manum.

The Trojan slaves used to masturbate behind the door whenever Hector's wife mounted her steed, and Penelope (chaste though she may have been), once Ithaca was asleep, would always keep her hand in *that* spot.

Here, Martial casts aside the oblique comparisons that we have seen in the previous poems, and instead presents two vignettes on the sex lives of the main female characters from the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*.²³⁶ As with 3.76, the degree of obscenity varies according to the subject: the explicit verb *masturbabantur* characterizes the shameless *Phrygii servi*, while the actions of the more reputable Andromache and Penelope are euphemistically described by the phrases *sederat equo* and *illic habere manum*.²³⁷ Circumlocution, however, can be even more titillating than bare obscenity, as it requires readers to use their imaginations actively in order to reconstruct the poet's actual meaning. The effect of such titillation is not only humor, but a significant epigrammatic appropriation of Homer – we are encouraged to reread the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* in a different mindset (“perhaps Andromache had a carnal reason for wanting Hector to stay at Troy,” “Priam and Hecuba had dozens of children – how much time did they spend in the

²³⁶ The similarities between this poem and *Priapea* 68 are indisputable and have long been noted (cf. e.g. Kay (1985) ad loc.). Questions of potential influence are inextricably linked with those of priority, and these unfortunately lie outside the scope of my current project.

²³⁷ Hinds (1998) and (2007) 118-9 profitably discusses Martial's allusion here to Ovid's *Ars Amatoria*, where the *praeceptor amoris* warns tall women not to ‘ride’ their men (3.777-8: *parva vehatur equo: quod erat longissima, numquam / Thebais Hectoreo nupta resedit equo*; “a small woman should go horseback – since she was so tall, the Theban bride never mounted her Hectorean horse”). Martial, no doubt in the spirit of playful competition with his predecessor, ‘corrects’ Ovid by suggesting that Andromache rode her horse on a regular basis. On Andromache's apparent reputation as an especially tall heroine, cf. R. Gibson (2003) *Ovid: Ars Amatoria* 3. Cambridge: 393.

bedchamber?”²³⁸ “what *did* Penelope do for all that time?”). In effect, Martial is rewriting Homer for a more sordid world, and in so doing he seems to assert the dominance of epigrammatic realism over epic heroism. Of course, we must remind ourselves that despite such grandiose claims, Martial is still an author of epigram, and that any attempt to ‘conquer’ Homer would probably have come off as comical to his audience, I would argue by design.

IV. Conclusion

This chapter has demonstrated the large degree to which Martial’s depiction of the Greeks depends on how he relates them to the Romans. Whether in terms of language, art and architecture, or literature, Martial’s invocation of ‘Greece’ invites – and often demands – comparison with ‘Rome.’ He places Greek script directly beside Latin text, he fashions contests between Greek and Roman artists and writers, and ultimately he pits himself against the consummate Greek poet, Homer. Precise explanations for these juxtapositions vary according to context: at times, for instance, Martial might be engaging his readers in a learned linguistic or intertextual game; at other times, he might be calling attention to the persistence of Greek cultural influence in the Roman physical and literary world; at other times still, he might be rewriting Homeric epic according to epigrammatic ‘rules,’ by way of staking his own claim to a place in the poetic tradition. The common thread among all of these possibilities is Martial’s constant, albeit tacit, acknowledgment of the irreconcilable paradox underlying any comparison he tries to make between Greeks and

²³⁸ Priam receives the sexualizing treatment at *Ep.* 6.71, but not for his virility. The poem praises Telethusa, a particularly talented slave girl, capable of getting a rise in even the most impotent of situations: *quae... Hecubae maritum posset ad Hectoreos sollicitare rogos* (“who could arouse the husband of Hecuba at Hector’s pyre”)

Romans: the Romans (Martial very much included) want to dominate in realms where Greek priority and influence cannot be avoided.

My conclusions here are intended to set the stage for my next three chapters, which will explore how we can apply Martial's ambivalent treatment of the Greek past in general to his Greek generic predecessors specifically. I have already stressed the near-total absence of named Greek epigrammatists in the *Epigrams* despite frequent and more or less obvious borrowings, and my arguments in this chapter have begun to explain why this is the case. On the one hand, we might suspect that when he alludes to a particular Greek epigrammatist, Martial is challenging his audience to identify and recontextualize that poet within the sphere of Latin epigram as constructed by Martial, a tactic that can produce both humor and an air of refinement. On the other hand, Martial could very well be deliberately suppressing his Greek predecessors because he views them as rivals, and since these rivals write in a non-Latin language, unlike the many Latin poets to whom Martial explicitly refers, it is easier for him to pass them over in silence than to force his way in any direct sense into their long epigrammatic tradition. And the tradition of Greek epigram is long indeed, stretching from the archaic period to Martial's own time; Martial knew this more than anyone, and he capitalizes on this longevity by playing with an array of epigrammatic subgenres, inscribed and literary, for some of the same reasons I have discussed above. The coming chapters will reveal the deliberate inconsistency of Martial's commentary on and appropriation of three of these subgenres.

CHAPTER TWO: FROM STONE TO PAGE: MARTIAL AND INSCRIBED EPIGRAM

I will begin my survey of Martial's approach to Greek epigram, appropriately enough, with its oldest and most literal form, the ἐπίγραμμα, an inscription (often but not always in verse) written upon some physical object. Martial engages with inscribed epigram on two levels: on the level of inscriptional tropes common to physically inscribed epigrams, and on the level of specific allusion to Hellenistic poets who have themselves adapted these tropes to create fictional 'inscribed' epigrams for literary consumption. On both levels, Martial's epigrams range from apparently straight imitation of Greek material to more or less subtle adaptation and even subversion. The outcome of Martial's versatility is a delicate coexistence in the *Epigrams* between poems positioning themselves within the Greek inscriptional tradition and poems self-consciously positioning themselves outside of it. In effect, Martial distances himself from the Greek epigrammatists by suggesting that their inscribed poems do not belong in the Roman epigrammatic context that he has created for his own work, even though the very existence of this context is contingent upon a preexisting Greek inscriptional tradition.

It should be stressed here that the influence of epigraphic conventions upon Martial's poetry cannot be attributed to the Greeks alone, and elements of Roman inscription appear throughout, as will become apparent in several of the readings below.²³⁹ While I

²³⁹ Systematic study of the influence of Roman physical epigram upon Roman literary epigram has been sparse, and has usually been confined to commentaries on specific poems. Scholars have, however, embraced the interactions between Greek physical and literary epigram, as I will discuss in some detail momentarily. There has even been some interest in the role played by Greek literary 'inscribed' epigram on Martial in particular (see S.H. Blake (2008) "Writing Materials: Things in the Literature of Flavian Rome." Diss. University of Southern California: 85ff.), although Blake focuses within the context of her study mainly on the *Xenia* and *Apophoreta*. Blake's conception of Martial's 'inscriptional mode' *vis à vis* that of the Greek epigrammatists has informed my own understanding of their complex relationship.

do not wish to discount the important role played in the *Epigrams* by the Roman inscriptional tradition, the Hellenocentric approach of this chapter can be justified given that physical Greek inscriptions were directly and multifariously imitated by the Hellenistic epigrammatists to whom Martial was so thoroughly indebted (as the remainder of this study will discuss in great detail). I must acknowledge as well that Greek and Roman inscriptional *topoi* intersect at times, and that it can be difficult, if not impossible, to determine whether Martial is alluding to one tradition or the other. Accordingly, if I refer in this chapter to Martial's relationship to the 'Greek inscriptional tradition,' I do so with the acknowledgment that the Roman tradition is no less likely to be a factor in some cases.

Pre-Hellenistic inscribed epigram was a heavily context-dependent genre: all inscriptions were composed for a particular event and situated in a particular environment.²⁴⁰ This being the case, many such epigrams consciously interact with their physical context, whether by acknowledging their surroundings or addressing the readers standing before them.²⁴¹ It may come as a surprise, then, that Hellenistic poets would choose to imitate these sorts of poems in their poetry books: as Petrovic observes, the book is in fact inscribed epigram's "natural enemy" – "it bereaves the epigram of the entire system of semantic references which can be only partially replaced by the medium in which it is transplanted."²⁴² This poses a challenge to the poet, who is faced with the task of framing his epigram's lack of physical context as an advantage rather than a

²⁴⁰ The range of contexts is varied: spatial, religious, political, etc. Cf. Petrovic (2007); Baumbach, Petrovic, and Petrovic (eds.) (2010) 21-259. On the performative dimension of inscribed epigram, see Day (2007).

²⁴¹ On the role of the passer-by in inscribed Greek epigram, see Tueller (2008), esp. Ch. 3; Tueller (2010).

²⁴² Petrovic (2007) 50.

deficiency.²⁴³ And yet, as we will see, Hellenistic epigrammatists compose faux-inscriptions with remarkable frequency and variation, a habit which Martial appropriates (to say ‘imitates’ would give him too little credit for innovation) from the earliest stages of his career.

It will prove useful to summarize here the broad range of Martial’s inscriptional epigrams, so that we might get a sense of how thoroughly he engages with the subgenre. Poems pretending to be physical inscriptions are very common in the *Epigrams*. Most striking perhaps are the *Xenia* (Book 13) and the *Apophoreta* (Book 14), two early books of epigrams written to be attached to (imagined) gifts for (imagined) guests. Most of the poems in these books, like real inscribed epigrams, rely upon context for much of their meaning – each must be read as if affixed to a physical object on a specific occasion, presumably a *cena* or *convivium*.²⁴⁴ Similar to what we find in Books 13 and 14 are poems elsewhere in the *Epigrams* epideictically describing works of art, a popular Hellenistic trope, as well as ‘signs’ written as if for placement at a particular location (usually tied to Domitian, such as his palace or his birthplace).²⁴⁵ Adaptations of more traditional inscriptions are present throughout Martial’s work as well. He writes about two dozen sepulchral epigrams in the style of epitaphs for the deceased, often favored slaves.²⁴⁶ Along the same lines are eulogies, which, while not strictly inscriptional,

²⁴³ Bettenworth (2007) 70: “Herein lies both the basic problem and the fascination of literary epigrams: to make them recognizable as epigrams without referring to headings or preliminary explications, poets have to reproduce characteristic features of inscriptions, while at the same time remodeling them in such a way that the lack of a monumental context, instead of diminishing the quality of the poem, enhances its sophistication.”

²⁴⁴ On the context of these poems, see Leary (2001) [Book 13] and Leary (1996) [Book 14].

²⁴⁵ Poems on works of art: e.g. *Ep.* 1.109, 3.40, 4.47, 6.16, 7.15, 8.50, 9.43, 10.99, 11.9; ‘Signs’: 2.59, 4.44, 8.39, 8.65, 9.20, 12.15, 12.31.

²⁴⁶ E.g. *Ep.* 1.88, 1.114, 5.34, 6.76, 7.86, 10.53, 10.63, 11.69, 11.91, 12.52.

nevertheless use inscriptional motifs to praise the deserving dead.²⁴⁷ Equally common in the *Epigrams* are dedicatory poems, which describe offerings made by a plaintiff (either the poet or someone else) to the gods, among whom Domitian is frequently included.²⁴⁸ We might also include in the number of Martial's 'inscribed' epigrams those which narrate (usually with comic intent) the act of setting up a tombstone (cf. esp. 9.15, on which see below), or describe dedications of a sort not found in the physical epigrammatic tradition, such as Martial's honorary dedication of several of his books to various esteemed friends and patrons.²⁴⁹

The versatility of Martial's engagement with the inscriptional tradition should be apparent from the overview I have just provided, and this chapter will explore the ways in which the Greek side of this tradition, as represented both by actual inscriptions and by literary epigrams, factors into the equation. I will structure the chapter according to three 'sub-subgenres' of inscribed epigram: sepulchral and dedicatory, both of which occur in physical and literary forms, and epideictic, which is more noticeably present in literary poems. In each section I will analyze and compare specific Latin and Greek epigrams, and in the process we will develop a nuanced understanding of Martial's ambivalent attitude toward his Greek predecessors.

I. Martial and Sepulchral Epigram

Martial has about twenty epigrams framed as epitaphs written on stone. The majority of these, written mainly for friends and favorite slaves, adhere to traditional inscriptional

²⁴⁷ E.g. *Ep.* 1.78, 1.101, 5.37, 6.29, 9.30, 10.26, 10.50.

²⁴⁸ E.g. *Ep.* 1.31, 3.29, 6.47, 7.1, 8.15, 9.16, 10.24, 11.48.

²⁴⁹ Cf. e.g. *Ep.* 5.1 (to Domitian), 6.1 (to Iulius Martialis), 12.4 (to Nerva). 8.praef. contains a prose dedication to Domitian.

topoi. Christer Henriksén, in an essay surveying this conventional subcategory of Martial's sepulchral poetry (and expressly avoiding the satirical poems, which I will discuss below), enumerates some characteristics common to physical epitaphs, all of which appear in Martial's death epigrams. These elements of Martial's "epigraphic scheme" include identification of the burial plot (*deixis*), specific information about the deceased (name, age at death, social status, or brief biographical narrative), and deployment of standard formulas and motifs, such as appealing to the passer-by to stop for a moment and take pity on the deceased.²⁵⁰ The 'traditional' subset of Martial's sepulchral epigrams is consistent and straightforward in its application of these tropes. The Latin standard *hic situs est* (often abbreviated as H.S.E. on actual gravestones) appears in two poems: *Ep.* 6.76 (*hic situs est Fuscus*) commemorates a former imperial guard and soldier in the Dacian War; *Ep.* 12.52 (*hic situs est Rufus*) honors the poet and orator Rufus, culminating with praise of his undying love for his wife Sempronia. Another epigram, *Ep.* 10.61, on Erotion, a deceased six-year-old girl, adds further touches of pathos (*crimine...fati*, "by crime of fate" 2; *Manibus exiguis*, "to her tiny spirit" 4), but still situates itself firmly in the physical world by establishing both a location (*hic festinata requiescit Erotion umbra*, "here rests the hastened shade of Erotion" 1) and an inscribed object (*lapis iste* 6). Sometimes, however, Martial blurs the line between the physical and the literary, as demonstrated by the following poem, in honor of a certain Antulla (*Ep.* 1.114):

²⁵⁰ Henriksén (2006) 358-62. Henriksén's discussion refers mainly to the Latin *carmina epigraphica*, and he makes a strong case for their influence, even more so than the literary tradition, on Martial's 'real' epitaphs for actual dead people. His list of standard characteristics is Romanocentric, but these characteristics still adequately reflect Greek sepulchral conventions as well. For more thorough discussions of the latter, see Day (1989), Bruss (2005), Tsagalis (2008). For a general overview, see also Lattimore (1962).

Hos tibi vicinos, Faustine, Telesphorus hortos
 Faenius et breve rus udaeque prata tenet.
 condidit hic natae cineres nomenque sacravit
 quod legis Antullae, dignior ipse legi.
 ad Stygias aequum fuerat pater isset ut umbras:
 quod quia non licuit, vivat, ut ossa colat.

These gardens (your neighbors, Faustinus) and small farm and dewy meadow belong to Faenius Telesphorus. Here he buried the ashes of his daughter and consecrated the name that you read, 'Antulla,' though his own would be more appropriate to read. It would have been fair for the father to go to the Stygian shades: but since this was not allowed, let him live, so that he can honor her bones.

As with the previous epigrams, this one too establishes a strong sense of place with demonstrative language and reference to specific locations (*condidit hic* 3; *hos hortos...et breve rus udaeque prata* 1-2; *nomen... quod legis* 3-4). The sentiment that the parent should predecease his or her child was widespread in ancient inscription and literature; from the perspective of Martial's Greek antecedents, the theme occurs from time to time both in Greek epigraphy (although less frequently than in Latin) and in the Greek Anthology.²⁵¹ Interestingly, though, rather than addressing an anonymous passer-by, as is common in Greek and Latin funerary inscription, here Martial addresses a specific person, Faustinus (1), which is a practice far more typical of literary epigram. This subtle shift in the addressee, who is such an important component of Greek sepulchral epigram,²⁵² reflects an awareness on Martial's part that even in his most conventional poems, he is writing a very different kind of epigram than was once inscribed on stone.

Some poems, almost exclusively found in the second half of the *Epigrams*, are still more innovative, and occasionally even provocative. The following poem, for instance, concludes with an astounding twist on sepulchral convention (*Ep.* 10.63):

Marmora parva quidem, sed non cessura, viator,

²⁵¹ See Citroni (1975) ad loc. for an exhaustive compilation. The Greek epigrammatists made much of the premature death theme, most notably Antipater of Sidon, who provides a mythological spin in his fictional epitaph for Niobe, which laments that she had to bury all fourteen of her children, rather the other way around (*AP* 16.131).

²⁵² On which see Tueller (2008) and (2010), discussed further below.

Mausoli saxis pyramidumque legis.
 bis mea Romano spectata est vita Tarento,
 et nihil extremos perdidit ante rogos:
 quinque dedit pueros, totidem mihi Iuno puellas,
 cluserunt omnes lumina nostra manus.
 contigit et thalami mihi gloria rara fuitque
 una pudicitiae mentula nota meae.

The marble you are reading, traveler, is small indeed, but will not yield to the stones of Mausolus or the pyramids. My life was twice on display at Roman Tarentum, and it lost nothing before I met my funeral pyre in the end.²⁵³ Juno gave me five sons and as many daughters, and all of their hands were there to close my eyes. The rare glory of a marriage bed was granted me, and my modesty knew only one dick.

This epigram at first presents a largely unremarkable tomb inscription for an unnamed Roman matron, emphasizing her virtue, fertility, and marital faithfulness in true inscriptional style.²⁵⁴ Interestingly, certain features of this part of the poem echo epigrams from the Greek Anthology. Martial's juxtaposition of the stones of Mausolus (i.e. the Mausoleum at Halicarnassus) and those of the pyramids recalls a poem by Antipater of Sidon – a contemporary of Meleager whose influence on Martial deserves further study – on the temple of Artemis at Ephesus (*AP* 9.58.4-5): ...μέγαν αἰπινᾶν πυραμίδων κάματον / μνᾶμά τε Μανσώλοιο πελώριον... (“[I have seen] the immense labor of the lofty pyramids, and the prodigious monument of Mausolus”). Further, Martial's reference to the matron's five sons and five daughters resonates with an epigram by Dioscorides, a poet of the late third century BCE, which begins Πέντε κόρας καὶ πέντε Βιὼ Διδύμωνι τεκοῦσα / ἄρσενας (“Bion, having borne to Didymos five daughters and five sons...”). Bion, however, was predeceased by all of her children, and she was buried by “strange hands” (ὀθνείαις δ' ἐτάφη χερσὶ), a sharp contrast to the happy fate of Martial's matron (*cluserunt omnes lumina nostra manus* 6). It is entirely possible that

²⁵³ Martial is referring to ceremonies held at Tarentum (or Terentum) in the Campus Martius.

²⁵⁴ Latin examples are relatively plentiful, the most famous being the so-called *laudatio Turiae* (*CIL* VI 1527), a first-century BCE tombstone in which a husband (likely Q. Lucretius Vespillo) extols his wife Turia's virtues at great length. It is the longest surviving Latin personal inscription, 180 lines in length. Cf. e.g. N. Horsfall (1983) “Some problems in the ‘laudatio Turiae’” *BICS* 30: 85-98.

these apparent parallels are in fact simple coincidences, but even should this be the case, the fact that such coincidences exist should suggest a common repertoire of epigrammatic (sepulchral and in Antipater's case declamatory) imagery from which both Martial and the Hellenistic poets can draw. Decidedly less common is the astonishing conclusion to Martial's poem: *contigit et thalami mihi gloria rara fuitque / una pudicitiae **mentula** nota meae* (7-8). The word *mentula* appears like a thunderbolt – while the preceding seven lines would lead us to predict an equally decorous ending to the poem, Martial comically upsets these expectations by producing a primary obscenity out of thin air.²⁵⁵ This is our first clue that solemn funerary inscriptions of the sort written by Greek authors may not fit quite so well into Martial's crass epigrammatic world.

Having considered Martial's approach to sepulchral inscriptions in broad strokes, I will now consider some specific examples from the Greek tradition. The ways in which Martial irreverently engages with traditional modes of Greek inscription can be profitably explored by a comparison with the Menophila relief from Sardis, which dates to the late second or early first century BCE.²⁵⁶ Such a late date, although not representative of archaic and classical Greek inscriptions, will nevertheless allow me to consider first how the sepulchral epitaph on the stele responds to earlier inscriptional tropes, and then how this compares to Martial's own adaptation of these tropes. The inscribed poem explains the various elements of the relief:

κομψὴν καὶ χαρίεσσα(ν) πέτρος δείκνυσσι· τίς ἐντι; –
 Μουσῶν μανύει γράμματα· Μηνοφίλαν. –
 τεῦ δ' ἔγεκ' ἐν στάλα γλυπτὸν κρίνον ἥδ' καὶ ἄλφα,

²⁵⁵ The word *mentula* lends itself well to serving as the punchline of an otherwise austere epigram, and Martial exploits this technique elsewhere, as at *Ep.* 7.14 (on the loss of a well-endowed slave) and 11.90 (against anti-Callimachean critics). The tactic is especially common in the *Priapeia* (e.g. 8.5, 20.6, 45.7) from which Martial may have drawn inspiration.

²⁵⁶ SEG 35 1147, treated in a different context in Gutzwiller 1998: 265-7.

βύβλος καὶ τάλαρος, τοῖς δ' ἔπι καὶ στέφανος; –
 ἢ σοφία(μ) μὲν βίβλος, ὃ δ' αὖ περὶ κρατὶ φορηθεὶς
 ἄρχαν μανύει, μουνογόναν δὲ τὸ ἔν,
 εὐτάκτου δ' ἀρετᾶς τάλαρος μάνυμα, τὸ δ' ἄνθος
 τὰν ἄκμαν, δαίμων ἄντιν' ἐλήϊσατο. –
 κούφα τοι κόνις ἀμφιπέλοι τοιῇδε θανούσῃ.
 αἶ, ἄγονοι δὲ γονεῖς, τοῖς ἔλιπες δάκρυα.

- The stone displays a refined and graceful woman. Who is she?
- The writings of the Muses reveal it: Menophila.
- For what reason is there carved on the gravestone a lily and an alpha, a book and a basket, and in addition to these a garland?
- The book declares her intelligence, the crown borne on her head her office, and the number one that she was an only child. The basket is an indication of her orderly excellence, and the flower her youth, which the god stole from her.
- Well, may the dust lie lightly upon such a departed woman as this. Alas, you have left to your childless parents only tears.

This epitaph synthesizes an array of sepulchral tropes into a single poem. It is loosely framed as a dialogue between a knowledgeable narrator/interpreter (although not necessarily the monument itself or the deceased, as found elsewhere) and a curious viewer (perhaps the passer-by). Question-and-answer is not an uncommon structure for both inscribed and literary Greek sepulchral epigram, and we encounter it from the archaic period through the Hellenistic poets.²⁵⁷ Here, as in earlier Greek inscriptions, the dialogic structure of the poem imagines and ultimately creates a speech act, and in so doing forces a close relationship, however ephemeral, between the physical monument and whoever happens to be reading the epitaph.²⁵⁸

Many of the details are even more commonplace than the structure. Menophila is explicitly named and her respectable qualities are listed, some in connection with the various objects on the relief (σοφία 5, εὐτάκτου ἀρετᾶς 7), others independently (κομψὰν καὶ χαρίεσσα(ν) 1). Pride of place is given to Menophila's youth (ἄκμαν 8) and how she was robbed of it, a standard element of epitaphs for those who have died young. The last

²⁵⁷ E.g. AP 7.524 (Callimachus).

²⁵⁸ Tueller (2010) is especially relevant to this point.

couplet provides a traditional prayer for the deceased – may the earth lie lightly upon her (κούφα τοι κόνις ἀμφιπέλοι τοιῆδε θανούσῃ 9) – and a lament for her bereaved parents. To this extent, the Menophila stele uncontroversially positions itself within the long tradition of Greek sepulchral epigram.

There are, however, a few unusual touches worth attention. The reference to Menophila's office (ἀρχὴν 6) is remarkable, especially for a woman so young. There is also a surprising focus on literature, emblemized by the symbol of the βιβλος (5), and most strikingly addressed in the ambiguous phrase Μουσῶν γράμματα (2). Of course these references serve to honor Menophila as a woman of education and culture, but I suspect that another valence may be active beneath the surface, namely the literary position that epigram had come to occupy by the time this poem was inscribed. In other words, although carved on a tombstone, the relief's imagery nevertheless evokes non-inscribed literature, which is perhaps a tacit nod to the growing popularity of literary faux-epigrams during the turn of the second century BCE.

The following poem, a pseudo-epitaph for the dead Philaenis, provides a much later but still valuable example of this kind of a literary epigram. The poem shares a number of characteristics with the Menophila relief, and although the likelihood of direct allusion on Martial's part is very low, side-by-side comparison of the two epigrams will encourage some enriching readings (*Ep.* 9.29):

Saecula Nestoreae permensa, Philaeni, senectae,
 rapta es ad infernas tam cito Ditis aquas?
 Euboicae nondum numerabas longa Sibyllae
 tempora: maior erat mensibus illa tribus.
 heu quae lingua silet! non illam mille catastae
 vincebant, nec quae turba Sarapin amat,
 nec matutini cirrata caterva magistri,
 nec quae Strymonio de grege ripa sonat.

quae nunc Thessalico lunam deducere rhombo,
 quae sciet hos illos vendere lena toros? 10
 sit tibi terra levis mollique tegaris harena,
 ne tua non possint eruere ossa canes.

Philaenis, who has traversed the centuries of ancient Nestor, have you been snatched so soon to the infernal waters of Dis? Not yet had you reached the Euboean Sibyl's advanced age – she was three months older. Alas, what a tongue is quiet! A thousand slave auctions were no match for it, nor the throng of Serapis-lovers,²⁵⁹ nor the teacher's curly-haired flock at daybreak, nor the bank resounding with the Strymonian flock.²⁶⁰ Now who will know how to drag down the moon with a Thessalian magic wheel? What madam will sell these beds and those? May the earth be light upon you, and may you be covered by soft sand, in case the dogs can't dig up your bones.

Naturally the aims of this poem, a funny piece of invective pretending to be an epitaph, are quite different from those of the Menophila relief. Even so, Martial playfully and expertly adapts the same tropes discussed above for a satirical context. He transforms the 'question-and-answer' motif into a 'rhetorical question' motif, in which our narrator asks the deceased a series of sarcastic questions over the course of the poem. The effect is no longer dialogic, as in the Menophila epigram, but rather it reflects the scornful superiority of a contemptuous passer-by – the speaker simultaneously assumes the role of interrogator and responder.

Here too, the details are (superficially) commonplace. Philaenis' 'good' qualities shine forth as the narrator laments, "*heu quae lingua silet!*" (5) In a genuine inscriptional context, this might be an honest compliment – "Philaenis was a fine speaker." Martial, of course, amusingly eliminates this possibility through the subsequent sequence of unflattering comparisons – in reality, "Philaenis was a loudmouth." Just as Menophila was distinguished for her σοφία, Philaenis too had her fair share of knowledge (*sciet* 10); unfortunately, as the narrator points out, what she knew was how to be witch and a *lena*. Moreover, as with the Menophila relief, youth is an important focus in Martial's epigram:

²⁵⁹ A Greco-Egyptian god, equated by the Romans (according to Plutarch) with Pluto (*Isis and Osiris* 361e-f).

²⁶⁰ Strymon is a Thracian river.

rapta es ad infernas tam cito Ditis aquas (2)? The sentiment would be the same as in the Menophila poem (and many earlier Greek tomb inscriptions for that matter) were it not surrounded by exaggerated statements about Philaenis' advanced age; the statement is clearly sarcastic. Again, Martial has taken an inscriptional trope and turned it on its head for use as invective. Perhaps the most masterful example of this kind of adaptation is the poem's last couplet, which conveniently expresses the same wish as the last couplet of the Menophila epigram: *sit tibi terra levis mollique tегaris harena* (11). Were the poem to end with the hexameter, we might be cheered by the poet's apparent change of heart, but sadly for Philaenis, it does not. The pentameter's parting shot is savage, but undeniably clever: *ne tua non possint eruere ossa canes* (12). Philaenis' canine exhumation consummates Martial's total comic inversion of sepulchral tradition: in the end, she won't even be buried.²⁶¹

This impulse to subvert inscriptional norms for invective purposes was not, however, originated by Martial, as the following epigram by the Hellenistic poet Leonidas of Tarentum demonstrates (*AP* 7.455):

Μαρωνίς ἡ φίλοινος, ἡ πίθων σποδός,
 ἐνταῦθα κεῖται γρη῏ς, ἥς ὑπὲρ τάφου
 γνωστὸν πρόκειται πᾶσιν Ἀττικὴ κύλιξ.
 στένει δὲ καὶ γὰρ νέρθεν, οὐχ ὑπὲρ τέκνων
 οὐδ' ἀνδρός, οὓς λέλοιπεν ἐνδεεῖς βίου,
 ἐν δ' ἀντὶ πάντων, οὔνεχ' ἡ κύλιξ κενή.

The wine-lover Maronis, the sponge of casks, lies here, a crone whose tomb is crowned by an Attic cup, well-known to all. She wails beneath the earth not for her children and husband, whom she left in poverty, but rather because the aforementioned cup is empty.²⁶²

²⁶¹ Also noteworthy here is the anonymous *AP* 7.345, which presents another epitaph for a old woman named Philaenis. The Greek poem, however, is in the first person, and the Philaenis in question is defending herself against insults of the sort levelled by Martial in *Ep.* 9.29. The possibility of allusion from one poet to the other is intriguing, but issues of dating prevent any sustained analysis.

²⁶² This epigram is imitated quite closely by Antipater of Sidon (*AP* 7.353), to whom Martial alludes on a variety of occasions.

The humorous twist at the end of the poem – that Maronis is less concerned with leaving behind her family than with the unfortunate emptiness of the wine cup sculpture atop her tomb – anticipates Martial in both structure and tone, but Leonidas’ innovative combination of two invective themes, mockery of the dead and mockery of bibulous old women, finds no precise analog in the *Epigrams*. To be sure, Martial pokes fun at drunken women on several occasions, but never in a funerary context, and (unlike Leonidas) focusing more on their feeble attempts to disguise their bad habit than on their unquenchable thirst.²⁶³ Likewise, he mocks deceased crones, as we saw with Philaenis above (*Ep.* 9.29), but he targets their advanced age rather than their alcoholism. This latter group of Martialian epigrams is not, however, entirely removed from the sort of invective that Leonidas is performing, as the following poem demonstrates (*Ep.* 10.67):

Pyrrhae filia, Nestoris noverca,
quam vidit Niobe puella canam,
Laertes aviam senex vocavit,
nutricem Priamus, socrum Thyestes,
iam cornicibus omnibus superstes,
hoc tandem sita prurit in sepulchro
calvo Plutia cum Melanthione.

Daughter of Pyrrha, stepmother of Nestor, she whom Niobe in her youth saw with gray hair, whom old man Laertes called grandmother, nurse of Priam, mother-in-law of Thyestes, by now outliving all crows, Plutia lies in this tomb (finally), doing the nasty with bald Melanthio.²⁶⁴

This epigram is in some ways a more extended riff on the old age theme that we encountered in the early part of the Philaenis epigram (*saecula Nestoreae permensa, Philaeni, senectae...* etc. 9.29.1ff.). Martial pulls out all of the mythological stops to emphasize the fact that Plutia was quite old upon her death, which, according to Martial, has been a long time coming (*tandem* 6). He plays with epitaphic conventions throughout

²⁶³ Cf. *Ep.* 1.28, 1.87 (perhaps the best example, on Fescennia, who futilely consumes lozenges to mask the odor of the previous night’s drinking), 2.73, 5.4.

²⁶⁴ All credit for my translation of *prurit* must by necessity go to Ralph Rosen.

the poem, describing the lineage of the deceased, however preposterous, and concluding with a surprising subversion of traditional language: where we might expect *hoc sita iacet cum Melanthonie*, we instead find *hoc... sita prurit... cum Melanthonie* (6-7), a final jab at Plutia's apparently lascivious nature.²⁶⁵ It is striking that here Martial, like Leonidas, is using a sepulchral context to mock an old woman's uncontrollable desire.²⁶⁶ Further, both Leonidas and Martial comically suggest that even death cannot tame these appetites. They essentially turn the tomb itself into a living (albeit static) world, in which their two subjects experience different fates – Maronis sadly lacks her much-needed wine, whereas Plutia is more fortunate, as she can satisfy her sexual cravings alongside Melanthio for all eternity.

I turn finally to a type of Martialian inscriptional subversion which, while not directly present in Greek literary epigram, seems to have been inspired by it: the ironic transformation of a tombstone into an embarrassment for its dedicator. Consider first the following distich from the *Epigrams* (*Ep.* 9.15):

Inscripsit tumulis septem scelerata virorum
'se fecisse' Chloe. quid pote simplicius?

Chloe inscribed upon seven husbands' tombs (wicked woman!) that they were of her making. What could be clearer?

The joke of this poem lies in the double meaning of *se fecisse*, which can be read both as traditional sepulchral language to commemorate the erector of the tombstones (i.e. *Chloe*

²⁶⁵ Cf. Watson and Watson (2003) 354-6. On the inevitable and eternal admixture of lovers' bones in Latin poetry, cf. Prop. 4.6.93-4, spoken by the deceased Cynthia: *nunc te possideant aliae: mox sola tenebo: / mecum eris, et mixtis ossibus ossa teram* ("for now, other women may possess you: soon I alone will hold you in my grasp: you will be with me, and bone on mingled bone I will grind").

²⁶⁶ Old women and their love of wine and/or sex were of course a common theme throughout ancient comic literature. In Greek literature, cf. e.g. J.N. Bremmer (1987) "The old women of ancient Greece" in J. Blok and P. Mason (eds.) *Sexual Asymmetry: Studies in Ancient Society*. Amsterdam: 191-215. In Roman literature, cf. e.g. M. Harlow and R. Laurence (2011) "Viewing the old: Recording and respecting the elderly at Rome and in the empire" in C. Krötzl and K. Mustakallio (eds.) *On Old Age: Approaching Death in Antiquity and the Middle Ages*. Turnhout: 3-23.

fecit) and as Chloe's (presumably inadvertent) admission of responsibility for the deaths of her husbands. Here Martial has cleverly combined two themes common to Greek literary epitaphs. The first of these involves tombstones of murder victims calling for vengeance upon their murderers. A variety of such poems, transmitted for the most part anonymously, survive as a sequence in Book 7 of the Greek Anthology, one example of which will suffice (*AP* 7.357):²⁶⁷

Κἄν με κατακρύπτῃς ὥς οὐδενὸς ἀνδρὸς ὁρῶντος,
ὄμμα Δίκης καθορᾷ πάντα τὰ γινόμενα.

Although you hide me as if nobody saw you, the eye of Justice looks down upon everything that happens. The sense in this epigram of the murderer's evil actions recoiling back upon him clearly underlies Martial's poem as well, as intimated by the rhetorical question *quid pote simplici*? – Chloe's crimes will inevitably come to light and she will be punished, if not by law, then in the court of public opinion. The key difference in the Martialian epigram is that Chloe herself is responsible for her exposure. This thematic twist recalls a second Greek sepulchral trope: the tomb that somehow foils its dedicator. Perhaps most striking is the following poem, by the second-century BCE author Apollonides (*AP* 7.180):

Ἦλλάχθῃ θανάτοιο τεδὸς μόρος, ἀντὶ δὲ σεῖο,
δέσποτα, δοῦλος ἐγὼ στυγνὸν ἐπλησα τάφον,
ἥνικα σεῦ δακρυτὰ κατὰ χθονὸς ἡρία τεῦχον,
ὥς ἂν ἀποφθιμένου κεῖθι δέμας κτερίσω·
ἀμφὶ δ' ἔμ' ὤλισθεν γυρὴ κόνις. οὐ βαρὺς ἡμῖν
ἔστ' Αἴδης· ζήσω τὸν σὸν ὑπ' ἡέλιον.

Death's fate was exchanged, and in your place, master, I, your slave, filled up your loathsome grave while building the tearful underground tomb in which to bury your body after your departure. The sloped dirt caved in around me. But Hades is not grievous for me – I will live beneath your sun.

The point of the epigram, of course, is its grim irony, as the dutiful slave ends up

²⁶⁷ The sequence is *AP* 7.356-61. See also *AP* 7.310.

occupying the very grave he was digging for his master.²⁶⁸ In other words, the very process of creating the tomb has backfired upon its creator. Martial's poem, then, represents a skillful merger of this irony with the 'buried murder victim' trope, and the whole is greater than the sum of its parts. Not only does Chloe kill and bury her husbands, but the justice that is deservedly hers will inevitably precipitate from the inscription on the tombstone that she herself erected – she has effectively buried herself by exposing her guilt.

It should be evident from the readings in this section that Martial accesses and engages with a wide array of Greek sepulchral themes, both inscribed and literary, in innovative and often unexpected ways. His engagement with conventional tomb inscriptions tends frequently toward the invective, and while we might interpret this as playful denigration of Greek burial practice, it is important to realize that during the Hellenistic period the Greeks themselves were no less irreverent, as epigrams began to move from the stone to the page. Martial's contribution, then, is not so much one of competition with his Greek predecessors as one of creative transformation, continuing a long-standing epigrammatic tradition of reworking epitaphic tropes for a literary context.

II. Martial and Dedicatory Epigram

Martial's dedicatory epigrams are more various in subject and style; some narrate or are themselves cast as dedications of mundane objects to particular gods, others describe quasi-religious dedications to Domitian, and still others involve the poet dedicating his

²⁶⁸ Similar themes appear elsewhere, as in *AP* 7.261 (Diotimus), where a mother has built a tomb for her unborn child, only to die in childbirth herself.

work to a god (or in some cases to the emperor himself).²⁶⁹ In these poems as with the sepulchral epigrams, there is a complex mixture of engagement with dedicatory tropes and allusion to Hellenistic authors. But it is here that the idea of dissonance between traditional Greek epigram and Martial's Rome comes sharply into focus, particularly in the figure of the emperor, who in Martalian epigram overtly usurps the dedicatee role once occupied by the gods.

Before turning to the emperor, I will first look at the extent to which Martial's other dedicatory epigrams conform to Greek inscriptional conventions. An extensive overview of these conventions would be outside the scope of this chapter, especially given the huge variety of dedicators, dedicatees, and objects dedicated,²⁷⁰ but some very general comments can be made about common features of Greek dedicatory inscription, with discussion of specifics reserved for individual readings still to come:

At a minimum they declare **whose property the dedicated object has become**, but often they mark more fully the transfer of ownership from the dedicator to the divinity by **naming both parties** and other details of the transaction, such as **gift** and **occasion**. The act of dedication, the giving of the gift, establishes a relationship between donor and deity a relationship that the dedicatory inscription commemorates and announces to all.²⁷¹

In other words, all Greek dedications require a dedicatee, but many also specify the name of the dedicator, the object being dedicated, and the reason or occasion for the dedication. It will be useful to keep this list in mind as we evaluate Martial's own dedicatory poems.

The following poem lies on the (ostensibly) conventional end of the spectrum (*Ep.* 6.47):

Nympha, mei Stellae quae fonte domestica puro

²⁶⁹ To the gods: e.g. 1.31, 4.45, 6.47, 9.16, 10.28; to the emperor: e.g. 7.1, 8.4; literary: e.g. 5.1, 8.82, 8.praef. (to Domitian); 6.1, 9.58 (to others).

²⁷⁰ An excellent and exhaustive study of this topic remains Rouse (1902) (reprinted 1976), to which I will refer below.

²⁷¹ G. Umholtz (2002) "Architraval arrogance?: Dedicatory inscriptions in Greek architecture of the Classical period" *Hesperia* 71: 282. Emphasis added.

laberis et domini gemmea tecta subis,
 sive Numae coniunx Triviae te misit ab antris,
 sive Camenarum de grege nona, veni:
 exolvit votis hac se tibi virgine porca
 Marcus, furtivam quod bibit aeger aquam.
 tu contenta meo iam crimine gaudia fontis
 da segura tui: sit mihi sana sitis.

Nymph, who glides with pure spring in the home of my friend Stella and enters beneath the master's jeweled roof, whether Numa's wife sent you from the caverns of Trivia, or one of the company of nine Muses, come! Marcus pays a debt to you with this virgin pig, for ailing he drank of your water in secret. May you be content with this symbol of my crime, and grant me safe delight in your fount: let my thirst be healthy.²⁷²

The standard dedicatory elements of this epigram are readily apparent. The addressed deity is one of the Nymphs, who claims the poem's first word; the dedicator (Martial) names himself explicitly (*Marcus* 6), and also denotes his gift, an unspoiled pig (5). The occasion is one of absolution and subsequent prevention of ill health after a poor water-drinking decision made by the poet. Despite these traditional dedicatory features, however, this poem is not the sort of thing one would expect to find on a physical object, in no small part because the gift being dedicated is not made of stone, but of pork. Consequently we can detect some slippage as Martial blurs the lines between inscribed monument and ephemeral votive prayer. Moreover, the details of the dedication do not quite align with Greek inscriptional convention, whether physical or literary. While Nymphs were regularly addressed in dedications, the context was usually agricultural, and they would typically receive offerings of firstfruits or sheaves of wheat rather than live animals like Martial's pig.²⁷³ Meanwhile, prayers for good health or more often alleviation of an existing illness tended to be directed at Asclepius or Hygieia, not the Nymphs, although sows (along with rams) were in fact regularly sacrificed during these

²⁷² Martial was sick and advised by a doctor not to drink cold water (cf. *Ep.* 6.86). He disobeyed and so made this offering to the stream from which he drank in order to avoid dire consequences.

²⁷³ See Rouse (1902) 46-50. This is true of Hellenistic literary dedications as well: Nicaenetus, a 3rd-century BCE poet, casts a dedication of wheat to the Nymphs as a threshing tithe (ἄσσ' ἀπὸ λικμητοῦ δεκατεύεται) (*AP* 6.225).

ceremonies by petitioners with the means to do so.²⁷⁴

It is evident, then, that Martial, while seemingly aware of traditional Greek practices, does not bind himself by them. Rather than address his poem to Asclepius, for instance, he invokes a Nymph instead, regardless of whether or not this was a conventional choice. His main concern is wit, and he adjusts his dedication to fit the (apparent) reality: he fears that his sickness will worsen after drinking from the spring, and so the Nymph is a poetically appropriate addressee. This choice is even socially advantageous, given that the spring is situated in the house of Martial's patron Stella. By invoking a goddess who is under the roof – and thus under the control – of his patron (*domestica* 1, *domini tecta* 2), Martial indirectly flatters Stella himself.

We encounter a similar adaptation of Greek dedicatory tropes in Book 3 of the *Epigrams*, although here the changes are more subversive (*Ep.* 3.29):

Has cum gemina compede dedicat catenas,
Saturne, tibi Zoilus, anulos priores.

These chains with their twin shackles Zoilus dedicates to you, Saturn, the 'rings' he *used* to wear.²⁷⁵

This poem is highly formal. The dedicatee is the god Saturn, the dedicator, Zoilus, is named in the third person, and the offerings, Zoilus' slave chains, are clearly specified.

But although the epigram is quite standard in form, in content it is not. From the perspective of actual Greek practice, there exists some evidence of former slaves hanging up their fetters, but this seems to have occurred mainly after the resolution of wars between city-states, at which point the freed slaves would dedicate their chains *en masse*

²⁷⁴ Rouse (1902) 199-205, 220.

²⁷⁵ Now Zoilus wears actual jewelry (*Ep.* 11.37). See Shackleton Bailey (1993) n. ad loc.

as an expression of thanksgiving to the gods.²⁷⁶ From a literary standpoint, Hellenistic and later epigrammatists produced a fair number of faux-dedications in which various professionals hung up the instruments of their profession upon retirement, but slaves and chains in particular are not represented in what survives.²⁷⁷ More strikingly still, Martial's poem has an undertone of invective against its subject Zoilus (whose Greek name may well be relevant here). Throughout the *Epigrams*, as early as Book 2, Zoilus features as an object of Martial's scorn, condemned as a runaway slave, an ostentatious freedman, a poor dinner host, and a cunnilinctor, to name just a few criticisms levelled against him.²⁷⁸ Given the broader context of Martial's epigram books, then, the fact that Zoilus is the subject of this poem immediately adds a layer of irony which the isolated nature of physical Greek epigrams could not produce, and which has no surviving precedent in Greek literary epigram. The joke, of course, is that Martial is calling attention to the drastic difference between Zoilus' ignominious past life and his extravagant new one; such a poetic reminder of his former days is an unmistakable attempt to cut Zoilus down to size.

I turn now to the most prominent addressee in Martial's dedicatory poetry, the emperor Domitian, who has in the *Epigrams* no less than in other literature from the period been elevated to divine status.²⁷⁹ Departures from the traditional addressees of dedicatory epigram were not, of course, unique to Martial, and as Tueller describes, the

²⁷⁶ Rouse (1902) 233-4.

²⁷⁷ Examples include fishermen (*AP* 6.4, 23, 38), carpenters (6.204, 205), and archers (6.9, 13.7). See Fusi (2006) intr. n. ad loc.

²⁷⁸ Martial memorably says of Zoilus (*Ep.* 11.92): *non vitiosus homo es, Zoile, sed vitium* ("You're not a vicious man, Zoilus, but vice itself"). Cf. also *Ep.* 2.16, 19, 42, 58, 81; 3.82; 4.77; 5.79; 6.91; 11.12, 30, 37, 54, 85; 12.54.

²⁷⁹ On the divinity of Domitian in Martial cf. e.g. Szelest (1974), Sullivan (1991) 137-45, Lorenz (2002) esp. 111-208, Garthwaite (2009). A good recent discussion of Domitian as god in Statius is B. Gibson (2013) "Hymnic features in Statian epic and the *Silvae*" in A. Augoustakis (ed.) (2013). *Ritual and Religion in Flavian Epic*. Oxford: 127-44.

Hellenistic epigrammatists, especially Leonidas of Tarentum and Callimachus, made a variety of innovations in how the receiving divinity was portrayed.²⁸⁰ In a sense, Martial is continuing this pattern of innovation, but the emergence of the imperial cult has enabled him to take unprecedented approaches to literary dedications.²⁸¹ Domitian assumes divine status in the *Epigrams* as early as Book 5,²⁸² but dedicatory poems in particular are most concentrated in Books 7 through 9, which coincide with the emperor's successful campaigns against the Sarmatians and Pannonians beginning in 94.²⁸³ The very first poem of Book 7 sets the tone (*Ep.* 7.1):

Accipe belligerae crudum thoraca Minervae,
 ipsa Medusaeae quem timet ira comae.
 dum vacat, haec, Caesar, poterit lorica vocari:
 pectore cum sacro sederit, aegis erit.

Accept the savage breastplate of war-waging Minerva, dreaded by Medusa's wrathful locks. So long as it is unworn, Caesar, this can be called a cuirass; but as soon as it rests upon your sacred breast, it will be an aegis.

The form of this poem is fairly standard, and while it does not name the dedicator, the gift (*thorax*) and its recipient (*Caesar*) are clearly specified. The theme belongs to a long epigrammatic tradition of devoting one's armaments to the gods, and to Athena in particular.²⁸⁴ The prominence of Athena in Greek dedications of arms and armor makes her ownership of the breastplate in Martial's poem (*belligerae Minervae*) all the more significant, especially given that Domitian considered her a *numen familiare*, to the point of declaring himself her son.²⁸⁵ Martial's reference to Minerva no doubt recalls this close

²⁸⁰ Tueller (2008) 95-111. These innovations included having the receiving deity act as speaker of the poem, modifying traditional dialogic structures, and describing unusual or incongruent offerings.

²⁸¹ I am deliberately sidestepping the issue of whether Martial is supporting or subverting the imperial cult in his panegyric poems. My argument is rather that the emperor's takeover of the traditional Greek dedicatory form is significant in and of itself, whatever Martial's intent in so doing.

²⁸² Cf. 5.8 (*edictum domini dei que nostri*).

²⁸³ The dedications cease altogether in Book 10, after Domitian's assassination in 96.

²⁸⁴ Cf. *AP* 6.122-132, by various authors, on offerings of spears and shields.

²⁸⁵ Cf. Galán Vioque (2002) 50-1.

relationship, but I would argue that it serves also to situate Domitian in a position of superiority to the goddess. Minerva is not, as in the Greek tradition, *receiving* the offering, but is rather part and parcel *of* the offering: the poem's first line (*accipe belligerae crudum thoraca Minervae*) makes this clear, and the genitive leaves enough ambiguity to suggest that Minerva might even herself be *making* the offering, which has lost its power in her possession and can only become an aegis when worn by the new god Domitian.²⁸⁶ It is worth mentioning as well that in the Greek Anthology dedications such as these are usually made after the fighting is over, but here the wars have yet to begin, as indicated by the following poem in the book (*Ep.* 7.2), which is addressed to the same *lorica* and wishes the emperor well on his journey into Sarmatia. Martial has no qualms about adapting Greek dedicatory norms to the specific Roman imperial and military context in which he is writing.

There seems, however, to be more at work in this poem than just modification of Greek tropes. It is possible to detect allusions in *Ep.* 7.1 to a famous pre-Hellenistic epigram by Anyte of Tegea, who is noteworthy both for her Doric dialect and for her gender (*AP* 6.123):

Ἴσταθι τῷδε, κράνεια βροτοκτόνε, μηδ' ἔτι λυγρὸν
 χάλκεον ἄμφ' ὄνυχ' ἀτάξ' ἐφ' ἄνδρα δαΐων·
 ἀλλ' ἄνδ' ἀνὰ μαρμάρεον δόμον ἡμένα αἰπὸν Ἀθήνας,
 ἄγγελλ' ἀνορέαν Κρητὸς Ἐχέκρατιδα.

Stand here, man-slaying spear, and no longer drip around your brazen claw the baneful gore of enemies; rather, perched above the lofty marble home of Athena, announce the courage of Cretan Echecratidas.

At first glance this poem bears only superficial resemblances to Martial's: both are

²⁸⁶ The word αἰγίς appears four times in the Greek Anthology (*AP* 2.1, 6.225, 9.535, and 14.55), but only once in a dedicatory context (6.225), and coincidentally in the same poem by Nicaenetus (to the Nymphs) referenced in n. 30 of this chapter.

dedicatory, both involve an armament of some sort, and both mention Athena/Minerva.²⁸⁷

But these similarities should prompt further interrogation, which in turn reveals more interesting parallels. Both poets use vivid adjectives to describe the violent nature of the object being dedicated: Anyte's κράνεια βροτοκτόνε and λυγρὸν...φόνον find echoes in Martial's *belligerae*...*Minervae* and *crudum thoraca*, especially in the case of the compounds βροτοκτόνε and *belligerae*, which share the same first letter and number of syllables. The word *vacat* in Martial's epigram may also recall the present condition of Anyte's spear, which has been ordered to sit idly (Ἔσταθι, ἡμένα) in Athena's temple. Martial is perhaps suggesting that such an inert status (*poterit lorica vocari*) is well enough, but *his* offering should sit (*sederit*) not in a temple, but upon Domitian's holy breast (*pectore...sacro*), whereupon it assumes a truly divine status (*aegis erit*). In short, then, Martial has one-upped the events of Anyte's poem by adapting them to a Roman context in which the gods are not silent observers but actually walk the earth (or so Domitian would have us believe).

Whether or not the breastplate described in Martial's poem contributed to the success of Domitian's campaigns, they were in fact successful, which enabled him to return home, where he could enjoy the company of his favorite cupbearer Earinos. This was a relationship that precipitated a series of rapturous poems in book nine of the *Epigrams*, one of which (*Ep.* 9.11) we considered in the previous chapter. Relevant from this sequence are a pair of epigrams describing dedications made by Earinos, of which I will provide only one example (*Ep.* 9.17):

Latonae venerande nepos, qui mitibus herbis

²⁸⁷ Gutzwiller (1998: 56-8) provides a stimulating discussion of how Anyte's poem reflects her simultaneous engagement in and tacit rejection of male war vernacular.

Parcarum exoras pensa brevesque colos,
 hos tibi laudatos domino, rata vota, capillos
 ille tuus Latia misit ab urbe puer;
 addidit et nitidum sacratis crinibus orbem,
 quo felix facies iudice tuta fuit.
 tu iuvenale decus serva, ne pulchrior ille
 in longa fuerit quam brevior coma.

Revered grandson of Latona,²⁸⁸ you who with gentle herbs persuade the threads and short distaffs of the Fates, these locks, praised by his master, due offerings, has that boy of yours sent to you from the Latian city; he has added to the hallowed curls the shining circle by whose judgment his beautiful face was beyond reproach. Preserve his youthful beauty, so that he is no less handsome now with short hair than he used to be with long.

The character of this poem, in which the unnamed Earinos dedicates his hair and mirror to Aesculapius with an accompanying prayer for prolonged youth, is patently dedicatory, and as Christer Henriksén notes, it strongly resembles a number of epigrams from Book 6 of the Greek Anthology. Like this one, the Greek poems follow a conventional arrangement consisting of invocation (though not always), dedication, and concluding prayer.²⁸⁹ The following example by Antipater of Thessalonica, an Augustan epigrammatist, bears some significant similarities to Martial's poem (*AP* 6.198):

Ὀριον ἀνθήσαντας ὑπὸ κροτάφοισιν ἰούλους
 κειράμενος, γενύων ἄρσενας ἀγγελίας,
 Φοῖβῳ θῆκε Λύκων πρῶτον γέρας· εὖξάτο δ' οὕτως
 καὶ πολὴν λευκῶν κεῖραι ἀπὸ κροτάφων.
 τοίην ἀλλ' ἐπίνευε· τίθει δέ μιν, ὥς πρό γε τοῖον,
 ὥς αὖτις πολὺ γήραϊ νιφόμενον.

Having cut the fresh-bloomed down beneath his temples, the cheeks' tidings of manhood, Lycon gave his first gift to Phoebus; and he prayed that he might in the same way cut the gray hairs from his temples when they grow white. Grant this request, and make him just as he is now when he is snowy with grizzled old age.

Lycon's dedication of his first beard to Phoebus, along with a prayer for long life and vitality, naturally invites comparison with Martial's take on the same theme. Broadly, the two poems are very much alike: in both, a young man dedicates his hair to a god (though the god differs) and this dedication is accompanied by a hymn. There is, however, a

²⁸⁸ Aesculapius.

²⁸⁹ Henriksén (1998) 111.

slight shift in focus between the Greek and the Latin poem. While Antipater's epigram emphasizes the hope that Lycon will live to enjoy a ripe old age (πολιὴν λευκῶν... ἀπὸ κροτάφων 4, πολιῷ γήραϊ νιφόμενον 6), with only a vague hint that he might retain some of his youth in the process (ὥς πρό γε τοῖον, / ὥς αὖτις... 5-6), for Martial, Earinos' continual youth and beauty are everything. His hair is sacred (*sacratiss crinibus* 5) not just as an offering but in its beauty, which brings praise from the emperor himself (*laudatos domino... capillos* 3), and the boy's mirror reflects this same beauty (*felix facies* 6). The poem's prayer is not for long life but for long youth (*iuvenale decus serva* 7) – the span of time most relevant to the poet is highly abbreviated, and extends not from adolescence to old age, as in the Greek epigram, but from pre-haircut to post-haircut. Antipater's poem helps bring into focus the superficiality and impermanence of Martial's dedication; his concern is not for a hypothetical gray-haired Earinos, but for the perpetuity of the beautiful Earinos who lives in the here and now. I would argue that an important reason for Martial's approach in this epigram is Earinos' status as Domitian's cupbearer (the Ganymede to his Jupiter, as the preceding poem, *Ep.* 9.16, styles the relationship). The dedication here is meant to benefit not so much Earinos as Domitian: for Martial, the emperor's happiness – and enjoyment of his cupbearer – is paramount. After all, what good will come from an aged Earinos in fifty years time, when both Domitian (and Martial for that matter) are long dead? Once again, Martial has transform a traditional mode of dedication into something more appropriate to an imperial context.

An epigram from later in Book 9 discusses Domitian more directly, and takes his role as *dominus et deus* to a new, highly conspicuous level (*Ep.* 9.64):

Herculis in magni voltus descendere Caesar

dignatus Latiae dat nova templa viae,
 qua, Triviae nemorosa petit dum regna, viator
 octavum domina marmor ab urbe legit.
 ante colebatur votis et sanguine largo,
 maiorem Alciden nunc minor ipse colit.
 hunc magnas rogat alter opes, rogat alter honores;
 illi securus vota minora facit.

Caesar, deeming fit to descend into the countenance of great Hercules, builds a new temple on the Latin road,²⁹⁰ where a traveler, while making his way to the wooded realms of Trivia, reads the eighth milestone from mistress Rome. In the past Alcides was worshiped with vows and copious blood, but now he, himself the lesser Alcides, worships the greater one. People ask the latter for great wealth, for honors; to the former they are content to make lesser vows.

This is an interesting poem in and of itself, both independently and in the larger context of Book 9 – it is the first of a series of three epigrams establishing Domitian’s superiority to Hercules, culminating in the longest poem of the book, which triumphantly compares Domitian’s accomplishments to Hercules’ labors.²⁹¹ As it relates to the Greek inscribed tradition, the poem is not a traditional dedicatory poem *per se*, but rather describes the emperor’s own dedication of a temple. In spite of this narrative form, however, inscriptional nuances are not entirely absent: the description of an abstract traveller or passer-by (*viator* 3) reading a physical object (*octavum... marmor... legit* 4) activates a distinct inscriptional subtext, and it is not inconceivable that an epigram like this could have been inscribed upon the temple itself on the occasion of its dedication. In fact, the opening of the poem bears three standard dedicatory elements: a dedicator (*Caesar* 1), a gift (*nova templa* 2), and an ostensible dedicatee (*Herculis* 1). The obvious twist on the traditional is that the hybrid form of the temple’s statue (Domitian’s face on Hercules’ body) enables Domitian, the ‘new’ Hercules, to receive the bulk of the worship, placing

²⁹⁰ The Via Appia. The temple’s existence is unattested outside of Martial, but evidently it contained a statue of Hercules bearing Domitian’s likeness. Cf. Henriksén (1998-9) 65.

²⁹¹ The series is 9.64, 9.65, and 9.101 – cf. Henriksén (1998-9) 66. Lorenz contextualizes these poems literarily amidst various other Hercules-related poems in Book 9 – see S. Lorenz (2003) “Martial, Herkules und Domitian: Büsten, Statuetten und Statuen im *Epigrammaton Liber Nonus*.” *Mnemosyne* 56: 566-84.

the ‘original’ Hercules in the position of himself venerating his successor (*maiores Alciden nunc minor ipse colit* 6).

The hybridity of the statue described by Martial recalls two literary Greek epigrams which, while not framed as dedications, also depict hybrid statues with Herculean components. Whether or not Martial had these specific poems in mind during his composition of *Ep.* 9.64, they certainly reflect Greek attitudes toward worshipping amalgamations of gods, attitudes which were available to Martial as a participant in the Greek epigrammatic tradition. The later of the two poems, by first-century BCE Epicurean philosopher Philodemus, depicts an unusual (and otherwise unheard of) triple statue (*AP* 16.234):²⁹²

Τρισσοὺς ἀθανάτους χωρεῖ λίθος· ἅ κεφαλὰ γὰρ
μανύει τρανῶς Πᾶνα τὸν αἰγόκερων,
στέρνα δὲ καὶ νηδὺς Ἡρακλέα· λοιπὰ δὲ μηρῶν
καὶ κνήμης Ἑρμῆς ὁ πτερόπους ἔλαχεν.
θύειν ἀρνήσῃ, ξένε, μηκέτι· τοῦ γὰρ ἐνός σοι
θύματος οἱ τρισσοὶ δαίμονες ἀπτόμεθα.

This stone has room for three immortals: the head clearly reveals Pan the goat-horned, the chest and stomach Heracles; the rest of the thighs and legs belong to Hermes the wing-footed. Deny a sacrifice no longer, traveller, for your one offering reaches three gods.

The chimera-like nature of this statue, according to Philodemus, presents an advantage to passing travelers, who are able to please with a single sacrifice not one god but three.

The second poem, however, by Leonidas of Tarentum, with whom Martial directly and indirectly engages on several occasions in the *Epigrams*, complicates the harmonious picture presented by Philodemus. It describes a boundary marker in the form of a two-faced statue, with the face of Hermes facing one direction and that of Heracles the opposite (*AP* 9.316):

²⁹² For recent commentary on the poem, see Sider (1997) 169-70.

Ὡ τάνδε στείχοντες ἀταρπιτόν, αἶτε ποτ' ἀγροῦς
 δαμόθεν αἶτ' ἀπ' ἀγρῶν νεῖσθε ποτ' ἀκρόπολιν,
 ἅμμες ὄρων φύλακες δισσοὶ θεοί, ὣν ὁ μὲν Ἑρμᾶς,
 οἷον ὀρήϊ μ', οὗτος δ' ἄτερος Ἡρακλέης·
 ἅμφω μὲν θνατοῖς εὐάκοοι, ἀλλὰ ποθ' οὗτος, 5
 αἶτ' ὠμὰς παραθῆς ἀχράδας, ἐγκέκαφεν·
 ναὶ μὰν ὡσαύτως τοὺς βότρυας, αἶτε πέλονται
 ὄριμοι αἶτε χύδαν ὄμφακες, εὐτρέπικεν.
 μισέω τὰν μετοχὰν οὐδ' ἥδομαι· ἀλλ' ὁ φέρων τι,
 ἀμφίς, μὴ κοινᾷ τοῖς δυσὶ παρτιθέτω 10
 καὶ λεγέτω· „Τὶν τοῦθ', Ἡράκλεες,” ἄλλοτε „Τοῦτο
 Ἑρμᾶ” καὶ λύοι τὰν ἔριν ἀμφοτέρων.

O you who walk this road, whether you are going from town to the fields or from the fields to the city, we two gods are the guardians of the boundary, one of whom is Hermes, just as you see me, and this other one is Heracles. We are both favorable to mortals, but this guy, if you so much as put some wild pears next to us, he gobbles them up. It's the same with grapes, whether they're ripe or not – he's ready.²⁹³ I hate this kind of sharing, and it gives me no pleasure. So whoever comes bringing something, let him offer it to each of us on both sides, not in common, and let him say, “This is yours, Heracles,” and then, “This is for Hermes.” He might resolve our quarrel.

This poem is of course primarily comic, playing on Heracles' legendary appetite to create a humorously quarrelsome relationship between the disparate personalities of two gods who are quite literally stuck with each other. But the hybrid nature of the statue might also be read as somewhat problematic, given Hermes' claim that the gluttony of Heracles renders a single offering of the sort we find in Philodemus' epigram insufficient. For Leonidas, when gods occupy the same votive space, sharing is a fundamentally broken concept, which might lead us to reread Philodemus' tripartite statue as an experiment doomed to failure, or else a grotesque amalgamation of divine body parts designed to ward off the *ἔρις* (12) of which Leonidas' Hermes complains.

Martial surely had ready access to the works of both Leonidas and Philodemus, and the ambivalent attitude in Greek epigram toward the hybridity of divine statuary may well have informed his perception of Domitian's Hercules statue, where Hercules' face was effectively replaced by the likeness of Domitian. The *viator* (3) of Martial's poem,

²⁹³ The unusual use of εὐτρέπικεν here has been interpreted by one scholar as an obscene *double entendre*. See H. White (1993) “An obscene epigram by Leonidas of Tarentum” *Habis* 24: 29-32.

like Philodemus' ξένος (5) or Leonidas' στείχοντες (1), would have been faced with multiple gods in a single statue and so would have needed to decide how to worship it appropriately. The difference for Martial is that the *viator*'s choice is simple: the emperor receives the real prayers (*magnas... opes, honores* 7), and Hercules (or whatever remains of him) gets only token acknowledgements (*vota minora* 8). Martial, then, seems to have erased the issues raised by his Greek predecessors: in Domitianic Rome there is no such thing as a hybrid divine statue; any statue of a god is also a statue of the emperor.

This section has endeavored to explore Martial's engagement with a long tradition of Greek dedicatory and votive inscriptional practices. We have seen that he embraces inscriptional tropes, but only to the extent that they are useful for his poetic goals. These goals, of course, vary from the apparently self-serving (as with his prayer to Stella's Nymph) to the invective (as with Zoilus' dedication) to the panegyric (as with his wide array of Domitianic dedications). But amidst this variety we can detect a distinctive pattern: Martial continually adapts, directly or indirectly, the work of Greek epigrammatists, both inscriptional and literary, for the very different imperial Roman context within which he writes. His very awareness of the Greek tradition, as I have emphasized throughout this study, reflects a keen respect for this tradition, but he is also aware of its limitations, and in a world where emperors are gods, dedicatory epigrams can never be the same as they once were.

III. Martial and Epideictic Epigram

The last section of this chapter will address so-called 'epideictic' epigrams, poems describing some object or place and surviving primarily in literary form. These were

popular among the Hellenistic and later Greek epigrammatists,²⁹⁴ and Martial imitates and adapts them with great variety; his range, beyond the *Xenia* and *Apophoreta*, includes Priapea, descriptions of Greek artwork, and even an inscription to be displayed on a bust of Martial himself.²⁹⁵ While it is especially difficult to generalize in the face of such thematic diversity, Martial's treatment of Hellenistic subjects and allusion to specific poems presents enough variation to reflect the same basic ambivalence that I have already discussed.

I will begin by looking at a unique transformation from the *Epigrams*: Martial the poet, author of inscriptions, becomes Martial the sculpture, recipient of inscriptions. Embedded within the prose preface to Book 9 (addressed to his friend Toranius) is an epigram written to senator and poet 'Avitus', who has evidently displayed a bust of Martial in his library. Embedded within this epigram is yet another epigram, written by Martial to be placed beneath the bust. The embedded epigrams run as follows (*Ep.* 9.praef.):

Note, licet nolis, sublimi pectore vates,
 cui referet serus praemia digna cinis,
 hoc tibi sub nostra breve carmen imagine vivat,
 quam non obscuris iungis, Avite, viris:
 "ille ego sum nulli nugarum laude secundus,
 quem non miraris, sed puto, lector, amas.
 maiores maiora sonent: mihi parva locuto
 sufficit in vestras saepe redire manus."

Famed (though you wish it not) bard of lofty spirit, to whom a long-delayed death will render just rewards, let this short poem live beneath my bust, which you've joined with no obscure men, Avitus: "I am he praised second to none for my trifles, at whom you aren't amazed, reader, but whom (I think) you love. Let greater men sing greater things: it's enough for me to say a few words, then return time and again into your hands."²⁹⁶

²⁹⁴ The two poems above on hybrid statues might themselves be classified as such, although in my opinion they straddle the line between dedicatory and epideictic.

²⁹⁵ Priapea: e.g. 6.16, 6.49, 6.73; artwork: e.g. 3.40, 9.43, 10.99, 11.9; Martial bust: 9.praef. (see below)

²⁹⁶ Martial also envisions himself in a patron's library at *Ep.* 5.5, where he asks that his books be placed with those of Catullus, Marsus, etc., far from the works of Vergil.

The preface to Book 9 has understandably attracted much critical attention, especially given its multiplicity of addressees, first Toranius (in the apparently informal prose component not quoted above), then Avitus (4), and finally the reader at large (*lector* 6).²⁹⁷ Little attention, however, has been given to how this preface inserts Martial – in a physical sense – into the same tradition of ‘inscribed’ literary epigram with which he is so thoroughly engaged on a poetic level, as we have seen over the course of this chapter. Transformed into a bust, Martial must simultaneously occupy the roles of both inscriber and inscribed object. In some sense, this is simply a more concrete version of writing an introduction to a book of poetry – the author is faced with the task of encapsulating his work for future readers in a way that will stand the test of time. This would account for some of the verbal similarities between Martial’s bust inscription and the famous first poem of Book 1 (*hic est quem legis ille, quem requiris* vs. *ille ego sum... quem non miraris, sed... amas*).²⁹⁸ But there is more at work in the Book 9 preface given that the bust’s inscription is attached to a physical representation of Martial’s likeness in the real world, occupying space in a way that a book cannot. Whereas Martial is constantly struggling to assert ownership of his book amidst a sea of plagiarists,²⁹⁹ he will always be the owner of his face, and so his bust’s presence in the library of a distinguished patron offers the poet a unique opportunity for self-aggrandizement without the risk of identity

²⁹⁷ Cf. e.g. P. White (1993) “The presentation and dedication of the *Silvae* and the *Epigrams*” *JRS* 64:58; Henriksen (1998-9) 47-50; Lorenz (2002) 187ff.; F. Grewing (2003) rev. of Lorenz (2002) *Göttinger Forum für Altertumswissenschaft* 6: 1053-70; Fitzgerald (2007) 150-3. The preface also recalls Ovid *Tr.* 1.7, where the poet sadly prays that anyone who encounters his bust also take delight in the remains of the *Metamorphoses*, unpolished though they may be.

²⁹⁸ The parallels between the two poems are not exact; notable in the Book 9 preface is Martial’s deployment of some tried-and-true techniques for establishing himself as an epigrammatist: tongue-in-cheek self-effacement (*nugarum laude* 5, *non miraris* 6) and assertion of a Callimachean aesthetic (*maiores maiora sonent, mihi parva locuto* 7). It must be noted as well that both poems belong to the tradition begun by the ‘pre-proemium’ to the *Aeneid*, inauthentic though it may be (*ille ego qui quondam gracili modulatus avena...* etc.) and imitated by Ovid in the preface to the *Amores* (cf. Farrell 2004: 46-52).

²⁹⁹ On the book of poetry as an object to be possessed (and stolen), see Roman (2001); Fitzgerald (2007) 73-7, 93-105.

theft. For Martial, a physical monument is perhaps the most secure means available to establish himself as a master of Latin epigram.

In other cases, epideictic inscriptions were more ekphrastic in nature, endeavoring to bring their inanimate subjects, typically works of art, to life. In the Greek tradition, nowhere is this more apparent than in the thirty-six epigrams from Book 9 of the Greek Anthology describing Myron's bronze sculpture of a cow.³⁰⁰ The authors of these poems show a consistent interest, perhaps confounding to a modern reader, in marvelling at the sculpture's lifelike details and vainly expecting it to move, graze, or moo.³⁰¹ The earliest datable example will suffice, by Leonidas of Tarentum (*AP* 9.719):

Οὐκ ἔπλασέν με Μύρων, ἐψεύσατο· βοσκομένην δὲ
ἐξ ἀγέλας ἐλάσας δῆσε βάσει λιθίνῃ.

Myron did not mold me, he lied: he drove me away from the herd as I grazed and bound me to a stone pedestal.

By way of understanding the significance of this and similar poems, Michael Squire helpfully suggests reading them *in toto* as a metapoetic self-reflection on the liminal status of epigram as a genre:

By probing the mimetic limits of Myron's artistic representation, these epigrams interrogate their own status as poetic simulations. The virtual reality of the bronze cow, in short, becomes a metapoetic icon for the virtual reality of the epigrams that celebrate it: the credibility (or otherwise) of the cow serves as an internal metaphor for the credibility of a genre—the various fictions that epigrams stage, fluctuating between a range of different ontological registers.³⁰²

In the case of Leonidas' poem, Squire argues that the prominent theme of lying (ἐψεύσατο) imposes a broader skepticism on the reader: not only does the motif of 'lying artist' invoke that of 'lying poet,' but we might be even more hesitant when the speaker of

³⁰⁰ *AP* 9.713-42, 793-8.

³⁰¹ On which most recently see S. Goldhill (2007) "What is ekphrasis for?" *CP* 102: 1-19; and especially M.J. Squire (2010) "Making Myron's cow moo?: Ekphrastic epigram and the poetics of simulation" *AJPh* 131: 589-634.

³⁰² Squire (2010) 609. Or from another perspective, "The gap between art and nature, and between word and image, becomes a metaliterary gauge for measuring the proximity and distance between epigram as engraved physical monument and collectable literary entity of the page" (Squire 2010: 617).

that poet's epigram is a talking cow.³⁰³ Squire's analogy between Myron's sculptural composition and the literary compositions of the epigrammatists who wrote about him offers a useful lens through which to examine Martial's ekphrastic poems and how they relate to those of his predecessors. Myron himself appears on three occasions in the *Epigrams*;³⁰⁴ only one of those poems focuses exclusively on his work, but it is not, as we might expect, the famous heifer (*Ep.* 6.92):

Caelatus tibi cum sit, Anniane,
serpens in patera Myronos arte,
Vaticana bibis: bibis venenum.

As a serpent engraved by Myron's skill is on your wine bowl, Annianus, you drink Vatican: you're drinking poison.

While Martial is a clear participant in the long tradition of poetry on Myron's realistic art, here he takes an innovative approach to its prevailing themes of falsehood and art versus nature. Martial's aims, as often, are invective: where Myron was the liar in the Greek tradition, that role has now been securely transferred onto Annianus, who attempts to mask the poor quality of his wine by drinking it from a bowl whose quality is far better.³⁰⁵ Martial effectively exploits the false realism of Myron's serpent to expose Annianus as the true fraud – if anything, the snake is the most honest part of the poem, since its *venenum*, the *Vaticana*, is very real indeed. It seems, according to Martial, that the everyday deception of his contemporary Romans is much more cause for concern than artistic (or poetic) dissimulation.

This is not of course to suggest that Martial is unconcerned with how his Greek

³⁰³ Squire (2010) 603-4.

³⁰⁴ *Ep.* 4.39 and 8.50 refer to Myron only in passing as a representative of high-quality sculpture. *Ep.* 6.92 I discuss here.

³⁰⁵ A similar theme appears in *Ep.* 8.6, on Euctus, who shamelessly serves new wine in old cups. I will discuss this poem further in Chapter 3.

predecessors understood the relationship between works of art and reality. On the contrary, Martial's frequent claims to the realism of his poetry, as we saw in the previous chapter, betray a keen interest in scrutinizing the ability of art to depict life. He tackles the issue head-on in an epigram from Book 11 (*Ep.* 11.9) :

Clarus fronde Iovis, Romani fama cothurni,
spirat Apellea redditus arte Memor.

Memor, famed in Jupiter's wreaths, glory of the Roman tragedian, breathes, rendered by Apelles' skill.³⁰⁶

The basic point of the poem, that Memor's painter is so talented that he practically lends breath (*spirat*) to his work, is unremarkable, belonging to the same tradition as the Myron epigrams and a host of others gathered in Books 9 and 16 of the Greek Anthology. More remarkable, though, is Martial's invocation of a Greek archetype, Apelles, to represent the apex of the painter's skill.³⁰⁷ Apelles is himself the subject of several Greek ekphrastic epigrams by Martial's predecessors, including Archias, Antipater of Sidon, and this excerpt by Leonidas (*AP* 16.182.1-4):³⁰⁸

Τὰν ἐκφυγοῦσαν ματρὸς ἐκ κόλπων ἔτι
ἀφρῶ τε μορμύρουσαν εὖλεχῇ Κύπριν
ἴδ', ὥς Ἀπελλῆς κάλλος ἡμερώτατον
οὐ γραπτόν, ἀλλ' ἐμψυχον ἐξεμάξατο...

Behold Cypris, patroness of wedded bliss, just risen from her mother's bosom, still bubbling with foam – see how Apelles rendered her most desirable beauty, not painted, but breathing...

The trope of breathing artwork produces a verbal parallel between this poem (ἐμψυχον) and Martial's (*spirat*), and whether or not this is an intentional echo, Martial's wholesale participation in Greek epigrammatic ekphrasis – right down to the Greek artist – is significant. But Martial is not one to imitate without innovation, and this poem is no

³⁰⁶ Scaevus Memor was a Roman tragic playwright and contemporary of Martial (*OCD* s.v. Memor, Scaevus). A fragment of his work survives (Ribbeck 1871: 232). Apelles was a fourth-century BCE Greek painter of great renown (*NP* s.v. Apelles (4); mentioned also by Pliny the Elder at *NH* 35.79), used here metonymically.

³⁰⁷ We saw this with Phidias and architecture in Chapter 1.

³⁰⁸ The sequence, *AP* 16.178-82, is on Apelles' illustration of Aphrodite Anadyomene.

exception. Not only does he invoke Apelles, a Greek artist, but this Greek artist (or rather his anonymous contemporary surrogate) has lent his talent to the portrayal of a *Roman* artist, the tragedian Memor. Martial's epigram, then, is a Roman depiction of a Greek depiction of a Roman artist whose business is making Greek-style (*cothurnus* refers to the Greek κόθορνος) depictions. This convoluted layering of artistic representation has two effects: first, it establishes an almost Platonic gap between art (Memor's plays, Apelles' painting, Martial's poem) and reality (Memor himself); second, it creates a Gordian knot of connections between Greek and Roman art, a phenomenon which can be readily applied also to Greek and Roman epigram.

This kaleidoscopic coexistence of Greek and Roman art comes further into focus in Martial's treatment of the Greek sculptor Lysippus. In the previous chapter we looked at *Ep.* 9.44, in which Martial favorably confuses a bronze statue of Hercules by Lysippus with a work of Phidias. That poem is preceded by a more substantial ekphrasis of the statue itself and its far-flung travels (*Ep.* 9.43).³⁰⁹

Hic qui dura sedens porrecto saxa leone mitigat, exiguo magnus in aere deus, quaeque tulit, spectat resupino sidera vultu, cuius laeva calet robore, dextra mero: non est fama recens nec nostri gloria caeli;	5
nobile Lysippi munus opusque vides. hoc habuit numen Pellaei mensa tyranni, qui cito perdomito victor in orbe iacet; hunc puer ad Libycas iuraverat Hannibal aras; iusserat hic Sullam ponere regna trucem.	10
offensus variae tumidis terroribus aulae privatos gaudet nunc habitare lares, utque fuit quondam placidi conviva Molorchi, sic voluit docti Vindicis esse deus.	

³⁰⁹ Statius (*Silv.* 4.6) describes the same statue in great detail. The appearance and pedigree of the statue are identical, which suggests either that one of the poets imitated the other or that they were writing under common orders. Noteworthy in Statius' poem is a catalog of Greek artists, two of which I have already discussed in this section (25-30): *hic tibi quae docto multum vigilata Myroni / aera, laboriferi vivunt quae marmora caelo / Praxitelis, quod ebur Pisaeo pollice rasum, / quid Polycleteis iussum spirare caminis, / linea quae veterem longe fateatur Apellen, / monstrabit...*

He who sits upon hard rocks, softening them with an outstretched lionskin, a great god in slight bronze, who watches with upward gaze the stars that he carried, whose left hand blazes with a club, the right with wine, he is no recent marvel nor the glory of our chisel; no, you see the noble gift and work of Lysippus. This god belonged to the table of the Pellaean tyrant,³¹⁰ who lies victorious in the realm he swiftly subdued; by him young Hannibal swore at a Libyan altar; he bade savage Sulla set aside his power. Annoyed by the swollen fears of various courts, he now delights to dwell in private households, and just as he was once the guest of peaceful Molorchus,³¹¹ just so has the god chosen to belong to learned Vindex.

Martial places a fair amount of emphasis early in this poem on the statue's non-Roman origins as the work of a Greek sculptor in the court of Alexander the Great: he distances the sculpture from contemporary Rome both temporally (*non est fama recens* 5) and culturally (*nec nostri gloria caeli* 5 – note how the word *nostri* suggests an 'us vs. them' mentality). As the poem proceeds, however, Martial gradually guides the statue away from Greece through the hands of significant figures in Roman history (Hannibal and Sulla) until it finally ends up in the private household of his addressee Vindex. One gets the sense by the end of the epigram that Hercules is not truly at home until he reaches the 'peaceful' world of Flavian Rome.³¹²

This image of Hercules at rest, away from *tumidi terrores* (11), recalls an earlier Greek epigram, also on a Lysippan statue of Heracles. The author is Geminus, a poet from the *Garland* of Philip, tentatively identified by Gow and Page as Roman politician C. Terentius Tullius Geminus (c. 50 CE).³¹³ The statue is rather different from the one described by Martial (*AP* 16.103):

Ἡρακλῆς, ποῦ σοι πτόρθος μέγας ἢ τε Νέμειος
 χλαῖνα καὶ ἡ τόξων ἔμπλεος ἰοδόκη;
 ποῦ σοβαρὸν βρίμημα; τί σ' ἔπλασεν ὧδε κατηφῇ
 Λύσιππος χαλκῷ τ' ἐγκατέμιξ' ὀδύνην;
 ἄχθῃ γυμνωθεὶς ὅπλων σέο. τίς δέ σ' ἔπερσεν; —
 „Ὁ πτερόεις, ὄντως εἷς βαρὺς ἄθλος, Ἔρως.”

Heracles, where is your great club, and your Nemean cloak, and your quiver full of arrows? Where is your

³¹⁰ Alexander the Great.

³¹¹ Hercules' legendary host, who took him in on his way to Nemea. Cf. Henrisken (1998) ad loc.

³¹² The analogy between Hercules and Domitian is probably in play here as well. Cf. Lorenz (2003).

³¹³ Gow and Page (1968) 294-5.

rushing might? Why did Lysippus mold you with eyes so downcast? Why did he infuse the bronze with grief? You are weighed down, stripped of your arms. But who robbed you? “The winged one, Eros, truly one of my heavy labors.”³¹⁴

The resemblances between the dejected, love-stricken Heracles of this poem and the star-gazing, wine-drinking Hercules of Martial’s epigram are limited, but their common thread – Lysippan artistry – should encourage further comparison. The tone of Geminus’ poem is sorrowful (χαλκῷ τ’ ἐγκατέμιξ’ ὀδύνην 4), as Heracles is weighed down (ironically) by the absence of his ever-present equipment, all in the name of love. Martial’s poem is more upbeat, in line with the version of Hercules being depicted, but the statue itself, suffering through the intrigues of various monarchical courts, is no less beleaguered (*offensus* 11) by its experiences than Geminus’ Heracles and his βαρὺς ἄθλος (6). With the Greek poem in mind, we might even grow suspicious of the peaceful happiness (*gaudet* 12, *placidus Molorchus* 13) of Martial’s Hercules. After all, the statue now dwells in the house of a man who, as Statius claims in a poem on the same statue, is accustomed to taking up the classic instrument of Greek poetry, the lyre (*chelyn exuit*, *Silv.* 4.6.30), which means that a hostile entity like Geminus’ περόεις Ἔρως (6) might take advantage of Hercules’ leisure. In other words, for Martial, the potential for Greek influence is always there – it is not only built into the pedigree of Lysippus’ statue, but it is also a fundamental part of the statue’s new owner, and of any poet, for that matter. As we saw in the last chapter, Vindex’s question to Martial in the following poem makes this alignment exceedingly clear: *Graece numquid... poeta nescis?* (*Ep.* 9.44.4).

Martial epideictic repertoire is not limited to the works of Greek masters. He engages with his Hellenistic predecessors also on the less elevated level of Priapea, as the

³¹⁴ The reference is to the story of Heracles and Omphale. Heracles played *servus amoris* to the Lydian princess, performing women’s work and in some versions of the story even swapping clothes with her (cf. Ovid *Fasti* 2.305ff.).

following pair of epigrams will demonstrate. The first is again by Leonidas of Tarentum (AP 16.261):

Ἀμφοτέραις παρ' ὁδοῖσι φύλαξ ἔστηκα Πρίηπος
 ἰθυτενὲς μηρῶν ὀρθιάσας ῥόπαλον.
 εἶσατο γάρ πιστόν με Θεόκριτος· ἀλλ' ἀποτηλοῦ,
 φόρ, ἴθι, μὴ κλαύσης τὴν φλέβα δεξάμενος.

I, Priapus, stand guard near the crossroads, raising my club straight up from my thighs. For Theocritus placed me here in good faith. So get far away, thief, or else you'll regret it once you receive my dick.

Compare Leonidas' brief Priapic poem to Martial's longer version, which makes the same points in a more elaborate way (*Ep.* 6.49):

Non sum de fragili dolatus ulmo,
 nec quae stat rigida supina vena,
 de ligno mihi quolibet columna est,
 sed viva generata de cupressu:
 quae nec saecula centiens peracta 5
 nec longae cariem timet senectae.
 hanc tu, quisquis es, o malus, timeto.
 nam si vel minimos manu rapaci
 hoc de palmitē laeseris racemos,
 nascetur, licet hoc velis negare, 10
 inserta tibi ficus a cupressu.

I wasn't hewn of flimsy elm; the shaft standing rigid and sky-high, that column of mine isn't made of just any wood, but it sprang from living cypress, the kind that doesn't fear hundreds of passing generations or the rot of interminable old age. O evildoer, whoever you are, fear this cypress! For if you harm even the smallest cluster on this vine with your greedy hand, the cypress will be planted in you, and, although you'd want to deny it, a fig will sprout.³¹⁵

This poem is less direct than that of Leonidas, and this may be an intentional effort by Martial to expand on some unusual imagery from the Leonidan poem.³¹⁶ The Greek epigram uses two rare euphemisms to refer to Priapus' erect phallus. A ῥόπαλον (2) is normally a club, such as that wielded by Heracles or the Homeric Cyclops, and while its metaphorical sense here is obvious given its position between the statue's thighs (μηρῶν),

³¹⁵ *Ficus* carrying the double meaning of 'fig tree' and 'hemorrhoid.'

³¹⁶ There may well be direct allusion here on Martial's part, especially given his apparent familiarity with Leonidas' work, some of which I have already discussed. Other influences are probably present as well, in particular the *Carmina Priapeia*: for the connection, see e.g. Sullivan (1991) 108-9, and E. O'Connor (1998) "Martial the moral jester: Priapic motifs and the restoration of order in the Epigrams" in F. Grewing (ed.) *Toto notus in orbe: Perspektiven der Martial-Interpretation*. Stuttgart: 187-204.

nowhere else is this use attested.³¹⁷ The word φλέψ (4) refers to a blood vessel (artery or vein), but its obscene sense is attested only here and in an earlier epigram attributed to Alcaeus (*AP* 6.218).³¹⁸ These unusual terms would surely have caught the ancient reader's eye, Martial being no exception, and this may account for the two similar references in his own poem. The word *columna* (3), typically an architectural term for a column or pillar, appears with phallic connotations elsewhere in the *Epigrams* (11.51) and once as a punchline in the *Priapeia* (9.8).³¹⁹ It is certainly not the same thing as a ρόπαλον, but Martial's fixation on the wood from which the *columna* has been made (*cupressus*, not *ulmus*) might recall the inevitably wooden nature of a Greek cudgel. More striking is the use of *vena* (2), which accurately translates φλέψ in a variety of senses.³²⁰ Its appearance early in the poem may serve as an allusory flag for the learned reader, and it encourages further comparison of the two epigrams.

Their narrative approaches are especially noteworthy: on the one hand, they make the same point, namely that thieves or evildoers should stay away lest they receive an unpleasant phallic punishment from the statue. On the other hand, Martial paints the picture with much more detail than does Leonidas. The φώρ (4) is granted some slight characterization: he is evil (*malus* 7) and greedy (*manu rapaci* 8), and his reaction to the punishment changes from one of pain and regret (κλαύσης 4) to one of embarrassment (*hoc velis negare* 10). Moreover, although both authors relegate the actual act of sodomy to a passive participial phrase (τὴν φλέβα δεξάμενος 4 and *inserta tibi ficus* 11), Martial's

³¹⁷ Cf. *LSJ* s.v. ρόπαλον A.II. Only this poem is cited.

³¹⁸ Cf. *LSJ* s.v. φλέψ A.1. The nearest similar attestation is from the Hippocratic Corpus (*Oss.* 4), where φλέψ means 'ureter.' This is anatomically close, although Priapus would likely disagree.

³¹⁹ Cf. *TLL* s.v. *columna* 2.B.1.

³²⁰ Anatomical, phallic, and even geological (both words can refer to a vein of ore, as in English). *Vena* appears in an obscene sense twice elsewhere in Martial (*Ep.* 4.66 and 11.16) and once in Persius (6.72). Cf. *L&S* s.v. *vena* I.B.6.

punchline is more sophisticated, bringing the poem's prolonged planting and gardening imagery (*viva generata de cupressu* 4, *cariem* 6, *racemos* 6) to its (un)natural conclusion: the birth of a 'fig' from cypress wood (*nascetur... ficus a cupressu* 10-11). In essence, Martial has expanded on the ideas from Leonidas' poem by introducing new and unexpected elements, some, no doubt, of his own making, others echoed in parallel Latin traditions, such as the *Priapea*.³²¹ The result is a complex and variegated picture of how Martial integrates the Greek epigrammatic tradition into his poetry on a deep but latent level.

As we have seen, Martial's engagement with Greek epideictic epigram focuses mainly on depictions of art, whether the work of a famous Greek sculptor, a rustic statue to a Priapic god, or a physical likeness of Martial himself. He repeatedly makes the point that Greek art connects to and overlaps with Roman art, and this serves as a convenient parallel for the ways in which he construes (theoretically and practically) the relationship between Greek and Roman epigram.

IV. Conclusion

This chapter has sought to commence my analysis of Martial's interaction with the Greek epigrammatic tradition by looking at how he relates to Greek epigram in its most literal sense: something written (or purporting to be written) on something else, an ἐπίγραμμα. We have explored three subcategories of inscribed epigram, each with its own distinct characteristics, and each treated by Martial with variety and nuance. Martialian

³²¹ The dating of the *Priapea* remains a vexed issue, and Martial lies at the heart of the debate. Cf. e.g. Richlin (1992) 141-3.

sepulchral epigram, like its Hellenistic predecessors, uses traditional tropes for invective or even obscene purposes, which can be understood as the Latin evolution of a Greek phenomenon. Martial's dedicatory epigrams, meanwhile, borrow as needed from Greek models, but apply those borrowings to a uniquely Roman context where the emperor has usurped the role traditionally occupied by the gods. Finally, his epideictic epigrams reveal a keen interest in Greek art and its inextricable links to Roman art, a relationship that Martial himself models, as seen by the fluidity with which he incorporates Greek epideictic poems into his own work. Examining these three subcategories has hopefully produced a clearer understanding of the multivalent landscape of Martialian inscribed epigram and its close – but not too close – relationship with the Greek tradition.

This concept of proximity is especially germane to my next chapter, which will take a chronological approach to examining Martial's erotic epigrams, as refracted through the varied lenses of his engagement with individual Greek epigrammatists. We will find, as here, that these one-on-one authorial relationships reflect an attitude of simultaneous respect, irreverence, and frivolity on Martial's part, which in turn betrays a deep-seated ambivalence about what it means for him to be a Roman writing in a fundamentally Greek genre of epigram.

CHAPTER THREE: HELLENISTIC LOVE IN FLAVIAN ROME: MARTIAL AND EROTIC EPIGRAM

As we saw in the previous chapter, the Hellenistic tradition of literary sepulchral, dedicatory, and epideictic epigrams arose organically from the existence of actual inscribed epigrams on similar subjects. Hellenistic amatory epigram, however, cannot be so readily explained, given that it has no real inscriptional precedent.³²² Scholars variously trace the roots of Greek erotic epigram back to sympotic (or “old”) elegy such as the *Theognidea*, lyric poems like those of Sappho, Menandrian comedy, and even Stoic and Cynic philosophy.³²³ Although a detailed exploration of these mysterious origins lies outside the scope of this chapter, it will nevertheless be necessary as we analyze Hellenistic love epigram to remain aware of its multiplicity of generic influences and potentially sympotic performative context.

Acknowledgment of performative context should not, however, blind us to the importance of literary context in our study of erotic epigram, especially in comparison with the highly literary poems of Martial. One of Kathryn Gutzwiller’s fundamental contributions to this school of thought is her convincing argument that Hellenistic epigrams were composed in single-author book collections, a realization which opens up a range of interpretive approaches: individual epigrams should be read not only as isolated poems, but in relation to and juxtaposed with the other poems in the collection, as elements of a larger structure. The context of a literary collection also encourages the reader to construct an authorial persona on the basis of how the epigrams in the

³²² Gutzwiller (2007: 314) cites as a sole exception *kalos* graffiti and vase inscriptions, on which cf. N.W. Slater (1999) “*Kalos*-inscriptions and the culture of fame” in E.A. Mackay (ed.) *Signs of Orality: The Oral Tradition and its Influence in the Greek and Roman World*. Leiden: 143-61.

³²³ Garrison (1978) 1, 4-7; Tarán (1979) 1-2; Gutzwiller (1998) 116-20; Gutzwiller (2007) 314.

collection interact with one another.³²⁴ Obviously this kind of author-based approach is familiar from the study of Latin incidental poetry, but Gutzwiller's contribution has been to think about Hellenistic epigrammatists in a similar way, which will prove invaluable as we explore how these authors may have influenced Martial.

I will organize this chapter by author, given that clear stylistic and thematic distinctions can be made between the erotic epigrams of individual Hellenistic poets, as Gutzwiller's work has shown. The subgenre's earliest phase, dating from the early third century BCE, is well-represented by its founder (a title I use with all necessary caveats) Asclepiades of Samos and also by his contemporary Posidippus, who was thrust into the public eye in 2001 by the publication of the Milan papyrus containing over 100 of his epigrams, grouped by topic.³²⁵ The amatory themes of these authors were subsequently adapted by Callimachus, whose surviving epigrams include about a dozen erotic poems.³²⁶ Finally, Meleager of Gadara, best known for anthologizing these poets (and many others) into his famed *Garland* in the first century BCE, was himself a prolific erotic epigrammatist whose surviving poems reveal both technical skill and a high propensity for allusion to the very poets of which the *Garland* was composed.

Hellenistic love epigrams made their mark on Latin poetry well before Martial. This is evident at least as early as Lucretius, whose *De rerum natura*, primarily in Book 4, engages with erotic tropes (love as an arrow wound, love as a hunt, the *exclusus amator*)

³²⁴ Gutzwiller (1998), esp. 3-14.

³²⁵ Bastianini and Gallazzi (eds.) 2001, with Austin and Bastianini (eds.) 2002.

³²⁶ Gutzwiller (1998: 183-4) argues that Callimachus' epigrams were published as a collection of *Epigrammata* by the author himself. Her evidence includes ancient references to the title *Epigrammata* paralleling similar references to the *Iambi*, and ancient commentaries on the *Epigrammata* dating as early as the first century BCE.

found with great frequency in Hellenistic epigram.³²⁷ More direct influence appears in the few extant pre-neoteric Latin epigrams, written by members of the ‘circle’ of Q. Lutatius Catulus.³²⁸ Two poems by Valerius Aedituus and Porcus Licinius, for instance, adapt the popular Hellenistic trope of love as fire. Aedituus’ epigram takes an analytical approach similar (as we will see) to that of Posidippus (Gel. NA 19.9.12): *at contra hunc ignem Veneris nisi si Venus ipsa / nulla est quae possit vis alia opprimere*, “...but no force can quench this flame of Venus, none other than Venus herself.” Licinius is rather more abstract in his imagery (Gel. NA 19.9.13): *quaeritis ignem? ite huc; quaeritis? ignis homost*, “You seek fire? Come here – do you seek it? The fire is a man.” Catulus himself wrote a poem (Gel. NA 19.9.14) very clearly modeled on a Callimachean erotic epigram (AP 12.43 = 41 Pf.): *aufugit mi animus; credo, ut solet, ad Theotimum / devenit* (“My soul has fled – I think, as usual, that it has gone to see Theotimus”) reflects ἡμισὺ μὲν ψυχῆς ἔτι τὸ πνέον, ἡμισυ... / ...πλὴν ἀφανές. / ἢ ῥά τιν’ ἐς παίδων πάλιν ὤιχετο; (“Half of my soul still draws breath, the other half... is completely gone. Has it gone off to one of the boys again?”). Catullus, whom Martial touts most often as a predecessor, was no less engaged with the tradition of Hellenistic love epigram, and his numerous adaptations, combinations, and allusions to earlier Greek epigrammatists betray a complex relationship with Meleager’s *Garland*.³²⁹ Likewise, the variegated influence of

³²⁷ For a concise summary of the evidence, see R.D. Brown (1987) *Lucretius on Love and Sex*. New York: 132-5. On the great concentration of specific types of erotic imagery in Hellenistic poetry, Brown remarks, “The prevalence of these [images] in erotic epigram, taken in conjunction with the proven influence of the genre on contemporary Latin literature, suggests that they were adopted by Lucretius in reaction to a popular literary depiction of love which he considered false and misleading” (132). See also E.J. Kenney (1970) “Doctus Lucretius” *Mnemosyne* 23: 380-88. For a more recent take on the influence of Meleagrian and Philodemian love epigram in the first book of *DRN*, see L. Edmunds (2002) “Mars as Hellenistic lover: *De rerum natura* 1.29-40 and its subtexts” *IJCT* 8: 343-58.

³²⁸ Whether Lutatius’ circle was actually a circle remains up for debate. Conte (1999: 138-40) suggests that some sort of affiliation was likely, united by poetic tastes if not social status or political ideology.

³²⁹ To go into specifics here would run the risk of filling the entire chapter, as the topic has long occupied scholarly attention. An early extended study is B.B. Boyer (1921) “The influence of Hellenistic epigram upon Catullus and his

Hellenistic erotic epigram on other Latin genres, especially love elegy, has been equally well studied, especially in recent years.³³⁰

It is indisputable, then, that Hellenistic love epigram was readily available as a model for any Flavian poet who chose to write on erotic themes. Admittedly, by the time Martial wrote, these Greek authors were by no means the only possible erotic influences upon his work. Indeed, the very same Roman authors who allude to Hellenistic love poetry – Catullus and the elegists in particular – themselves loom large in the *Epigrams*, and their presence inevitably complicates any search for parallels or allusions specific to Greek epigram.³³¹ Nevertheless, I will argue in this chapter that Hellenistic erotic epigram, insofar as it is a crucial part of the generic tradition in which Martial writes, is at least as important an influence on his poetry as his more explicitly-credited Latin predecessors. My analysis will suggest that in his own erotic poems he offers wry criticism of the various ways in which Hellenistic approaches to love epigram are incompatible with the ‘Roman’ context he has created for his genre, even as he uses some of those same approaches himself.

I. Martial’s Asclepiades

The earliest erotic epigrams, 33 in number (in addition to about a dozen whose authorship is disputed), were composed in the late fourth to early third century BCE by Asclepiades

contemporaries” Diss. University of Chicago. More recently, see P.E. Knox (2010) “Catullus and Callimachus” in Skinner (ed.) (2010): 152-171; K. Gutzwiller (2012) “Catullus and the *Garland* of Meleager” in I. Du Quesnay and T. Woodman (eds.) *Catullus: Poems, Books, Readers*. Cambridge: 79-111.

³³⁰ Again, a thorough examination is not possible here. See in particular A. Keith (ed.) *Latin Elegy and Hellenistic Epigram: A Tale of Two Genres at Rome*. Cambridge. The volume contains essays on the role played by Hellenistic love poetry in the works of Horace, Tibullus, and especially Propertius. For the case of Ovid, see the fifth chapter of P.E. Knox (ed.) *A Companion to Ovid*. Malden, MA.

³³¹ On Catullus and the elegiac tradition in particular, see D. Ross (1969) *Style and Tradition in Catullus*. Cambridge, MA.

of Samos.³³² In the preface to the *Garland*, Meleager refers to Asclepiades in the same breath as his contemporaries Posidippus and Hedylus (AP 4.1.44-5): ἐν δὲ Ποσειδίππὸν τε καὶ Ἡδύλον, ἄγρι' ἀρούρης, / Σικελίδεώ τ' ἀνέμοις ἄνθεα φυόμενα ("and in it he wove Posidippus and Hedylus, wildflowers of the field, along with the anemones of Sicelides").³³³ But beyond the time that he wrote, his place of origin, and his associates, information about Asclepiades is scarce, and so we must rely for our knowledge upon the few surviving epigrams in the Greek Anthology. In general, these poems tend to provide an intensely emotional first-person account of a particular moment in a lover's experience. The beloved varies from poem to poem (a maiden, a *hetaira*, a boy), as do the setting (the bedroom, the symposium, outside the beloved's locked door) and the speaker's attitude toward love (now delirious happiness, now frustration, now open rebellion).³³⁴ This protean quality should be familiar to any reader of Martial's *Epigrams*, and indeed it is the first common bond we can observe between the Roman poet and Asclepiades. This section will consider the extent to which such bonds exist, but will also examine Martial's creative adaptation of Asclepiadean themes and specific epigrams. In particular, I will argue that Martial distorts the momentary experiences depicted in Asclepiades' poems by transforming them into obscenities or commodifying them into self-contained objects (literal and figurative) for popular consumption.³³⁵

³³² For a thorough discussion of Asclepiades and his oeuvre, cf. Sens (2011), the first English commentary devoted exclusively to the poet. Earlier (but still quite recent) commentaries have been published in Spanish (Guichard 2004) and Greek (Nastos 2006). Gow and Page (1965) remains important, but lacks the single focus that the newer commentaries possess.

³³³ The patronymic Sicelides was applied to Asclepiades most famously by Theocritus (*Id.* 7.40).

³³⁴ See NP, E. Degani s.v. "Asclepiades" and Gutzwiller (2007: 315) for useful brief thematic summaries of Asclepiades' work.

³³⁵ This is not to say that Greek authors, Asclepiades included, would not have seen the role played by objects, especially gifts, in erotic relationships. Rather, Martial takes this phenomenon a step further, as we will see, by turning parts of the very love poems themselves into *apophoreta*. On the social economics of gift giving in an erotic context, cf. D. Konstan (2013) "'Can't Buy Me Love': The Economy of Gifts in Amorous Relations" in M.L. Satlow (ed.) *The Gift*

Gutzwiller suggests that throughout the epigrams of Asclepiades there exists a tension between the ideal of mutual love (which the poet often frames in a way that empowers women) and the “bitter reality.”³³⁶ The following poem memorably describes this reality, and in the process, according to Gutzwiller, encourages the reader to (re)consider the entire Asclepiadean corpus within the context of a fictional symposium (*AP* 12.50):

Πῖν', Ἀσκληπιάδη. τί τὰ δάκρυα ταῦτα; τί πάσχεις;
 οὐ σὲ μόνον χαλεπὴ Κύπρις ἐληΐσατο,
 οὐδ' ἐπὶ σοὶ μούνῳ κατεθήκατο τόξα καὶ ἰοὺς
 πικρὸς Ἔρως. τί ζῶν ἐν σποδιῇ τίθεσαι;
 πίνωμεν Βάκχου ζῶρον πόμα· δάκτυλος ἄως.
 ἢ πάλι κοιμιστὰν λύχνον ἰδεῖν μένομεν;
 πίνωμεν, δύσερως· μετὰ τοι χρόνον οὐκέτι πουλύν,
 σκέτλιε, τὴν μακρὰν νύκτ' ἀναπαυσόμεθα.

Drink, Asclepiades. Why these tears? What's the matter? You aren't the only one who's been abducted by harsh Cypris; it's not just you at whom cruel Eros aims his bow and arrows. Why live in the ashes when you're still alive? Let's drink the unadulterated drink of Bacchus. Dawn is a finger's breadth away. Or are we waiting to see the bedtime lamp again? Let's drink, lovesick one: it won't be long, poor man, before we go to sleep for good.

Gutzwiller positions this poem toward the end of Asclepiades' collection, such that it forces the reader to recontextualize the previous poems as part of a fictionalized sympotic recitation: “the call to drink,” she convincingly explains, “as a call to the symposium, urges the solace of song, so that Asclepiades' collection is offered as both a statement of the lover's condition and a source of escape from it.”³³⁷

This establishment of a fictional sympotic context is picked up in various forms by Martial. We find as early as Martial's first book an intratextual relationship somewhat similar to the one Gutzwiller describes. The following poem, in which an interlocutor at

in *Antiquity. The ancient world: comparative histories*. Oxford: 96-106.

³³⁶ Gutzwiller (1998) 150.

³³⁷ Gutzwiller (1998) 149. This poem has received some attention from other scholars, such as Garrison (1978: 23), who comments on its communal tone, and Sens (2011: ad loc.).

a drinking party advises his fellow guest to forget his amatory troubles with wine, bears comparison with Asclepiades' epigram (*Ep.* 1.106):³³⁸

interponis aquam subinde, Rufe,
et si cogeris a sodale, raram
diluti bibis unciam Falerni.
numquid pollicita est tibi beatam
noctem Naevia sobriasque mavis
certae nequitias fututionis?
suspiras, retices, gemis: negavit.
crebros ergo bibas licet trientes
et durum iugules mero dolorem.
quid parcis tibi, Rufe? dormiendum est.

You constantly drink water amidst your wine, Rufus, and only upon the insistence of a friend do you drink a single ounce of diluted Falernian. Did Naevia promise you an amazing night, and you prefer the sober debaucheries of a guaranteed fuck?³³⁹ You sigh, you're quiet, you groan: she said no. Well then, you should drink shot after shot, and slaughter your cruel pain with hard liquor. Why spare yourself, Rufus? You need to sleep.

Apart from the self-evident thematic similarities between these two poems, Martial's approach to the cure for lovesickness has some important differences from that of his predecessor: there is no sign of an authorial *sphragis* like πῖν', Ἀσκληπιάδῃ in Martial's poem; the commiserative tone of the Greek poem grows harsher due to Martial's incorporation of obscenity (*fututionis*) and violent imagery (*iugules... dolorem*); this harshness is then softened at the end of the poem as Martial transmutes Asclepiades' inevitable "long night" into the more desirable "sleep." At present, it is worth making the observation that Martial seems to be constructing a fictional sympotic context for this poem against which the other poems in his collection can be read. If we consider in this light the book's next (and last) erotic poem, some added point emerges (*Ep.* 1.115):

quaedam me cupit, - invide, Procille! -
loto candidior puella cycno,
argento, nive, lilio, ligustro:
sed quandam volo nocte nigriorem,
formica, pice, graculo, cicada.

³³⁸ Citroni (1975: intr. n. ad loc.) links these two epigrams, but does not elaborate.

³³⁹ As opposed to drunken debaucheries, for which consummation is less guaranteed. Cf. Citroni (1975) ad loc.

iam suspendia saeva cogitabas:
si novi bene te, Procille, vives.

A certain girl wants me (be jealous, Procillus!), one whiter than a freshly bathed swan, than silver, than snow, than a lily, than privet. But I want a certain girl, one darker than night, than an ant, than pitch, than a jackdaw, than a cricket. And you were already thinking of hanging yourself! If I know you, Procillus, you'll survive.

Here Martial portrays love as a kind of fruitless chase: the narrator is simultaneously pursuer and pursued, and if we were to base our expectations for the poem on Asclepiades (a fair thing to do – Asclepiades himself extols the beauty of a dark-skinned beloved in *AP* 5.210),³⁴⁰ we might predict that the narrator will conclude with a lament over the fact that the wrong girl is after him, to which in a sympotic context Procillus might respond with a consolatory poem similar to *Ep.* 1.106. Instead, however, the final couplet presents a twist (if not an entirely unexpected one given the foreshadowing verb *invidere* in the first line): the narrator's primary concern is not so much with his inability to catch his *nigra puella* as with mocking Procillus' jealousy over the *candida puella*. If anything, the poem casts Procillus as the one who needs to drink his troubles away. But should he recall an earlier epigram from Book 1, the reader will remember that the narrator is in fact no better off (*Ep.* 1.71):

Laevia sex cyathis, septem Iustina bibatur,
quinque Lycis, Lyde quattuor, Ida tribus.
omnis ab infuso numeretur amica Falerno,
et quia nulla venit, tu mihi, Somne, veni.

Let Laevia be drunk in six measures, Justina in seven, Lycis in five, Lyde in four, Ida in three. Let all of my girls be counted by flowing Falernian, and since none of them comes, you come to me instead, Sleep.

The narrator is practicing here what he will preach about thirty epigrams later: he is no less subject to the vagaries of love than anyone else, not least of whom is his forebear 'Asclepiades' from *AP* 12.50, and so he is both following the advice of the Asclepiadean

³⁴⁰ Cf. esp. line 3: εἰ δὲ μέλαινα, τί τοῦτο; καὶ ἄνθρακες θάλλωμεν ("What does it matter if she's dark? So are coals.")

narrator and paving the way for offering the same advice himself to Rufus in poem 1.106. It seems, then, that in this sequence of poems Martial, like Asclepiades, paints a picture of love as a universal affliction for which drink is the only alleviation. In *Ep.* 1.71, he has taken his Greek predecessor's advice, seeking a sympotic solution to lovesickness. By *Ep.* 1.106, he has reached Asclepiades' own level, and is now the teacher rather than the student. By the end of Book 1 (*Ep.* 1.115), Martial seems to have risen so far above the problems he faced in poem 1.71 that he is able to exploit and upset readers' sympotic expectations in order to create humor at Procillus' expense. But the fruitless cycle of lover/beloved in this same poem may suggest to us that Martial's sequence of poems could very well start all over again.

This is not the only occasion on which several of Martial's epigrams seemingly respond to one of Asclepiades.' The following comparison will demonstrate not only this phenomenon but also Martial's remarkable ability to objectify and commodify the work of his predecessor.³⁴¹ Consider first *AP* 5.169, which recent scholarship has suggested to be programmatic for Asclepiades' oeuvre as we have it:³⁴²

ἡδὺ θέρους διψῶντι χιῶν ποτόν, ἡδὺ δὲ ναύταις
 ἐκ χειμῶνος ἰδεῖν εἰαρινὸν Στέφανον·
 ἡδίων δ' ὅποταν κρύψη μία τοὺς φιλέοντας
 γλαῖνα, καὶ αἰνῆται Κύπρις ὑπ' ἀμφοτέρων.

Sweet for the thirsty in the summer is a drink of snow, and sweet it is for sailors after the winter to see the springtime garland. But it is sweeter still whenever a single cloak hides two lovers, and Cypris is praised by both.

The poem is structured as a priamel in three parts of increasing length, framed by ἡδὺ...

³⁴¹ Martial's commodification of the epigram form, and in particular the epigram book, is discussed in detail by Fitzgerald (2007: esp. 93-105). By transforming the epigram into a physical object to be bought and sold at will, the poet claims the advantage of being able to partake in the worldwide fame his book might receive, while dissociating himself from any offense it might give.

³⁴² Gutzwiller (1998) 128-31; Sens (2010). Gutzwiller in particular assertively argues that this was the first poem in Asclepiades' collection.

ἦδὺ... ἦδιον. Its form seems to have been imitated by Theocritus in his first *Idyll* (ἀδύ... ἀδύ... ἄδιον, *Id.* 1.1-2, 7), and Gutzwiller argues that the later Hellenistic epigrammatists Posidippus and Callimachus both respond more or less indirectly to Asclepiades' program as laid out here.³⁴³ Traces in early Latin epigram are scarce (no doubt due in part to the scarcity of surviving early Latin epigram), but certainly the poem, whether in an authorial or anthologized collection, would have been readily available to Martial. If, then, we read the *Epigrams* with Asclepiades' priamel in mind, several of Martial's most incidental poems gain unexpected shades of meaning. The following three poems come from the *Xenia* and the *Apophoreta*; each is attached to an imagined item, suitable for presentation as a gift to guests at a dinner party:

Lagona nivaria (*Ep.* 14.116)

Spoletina bibis vel Marsis condita cellis:
quo tibi decoctae nobile frigus aquae?

You drink Spoletine wines, or ones stored in Marsian cellars: what good to you is the noble chill of cooled water?

Coronae roseae (*Ep.* 13.127)

dat festinatas, Caesar, tibi bruma coronas:
quondam veris erat, nunc tua facta rosa est.

Winter gives to you, Caesar, garlands ahead of schedule: The flower that used to be spring's has now become yours.

Cubicularia gausapina (*Ep.* 14.147)

stragula purpureis lucent villosa tapetis.
quid prodest, si te congelat uxor anus?

The shaggy bedspread gleams with purple coverlets. But what use are they if your old wife keeps you on ice?

I would like to argue that these three epigrams reflect Martial's concretization and ironic inversion of the three elements of Asclepiades' tripartite priamel. Just as Fitzgerald

³⁴³ Gutzwiller (1998) 157-60, 218-20.

observes Martial's transformation of the epigram form into a commodity to be bought and sold, here I see Martial doing the same thing – even more literally – with the work of his esteemed predecessor. Admittedly, the likelihood of direct allusion in this case is fairly low (although I will demonstrate some striking potential confluences between the two sets of poems), but even if Martial is engaging only with *topoi* of erotic Greek epigram and not with a specific Asclepiadean poem, these *topoi* were earliest deployed by Asclepiades, and Martial's adaptations of them provide an indirect but informative look at how he responds to his predecessor's poetic legacy.

Asclepiades begins his priamel with a drink of snow in the summer (ἡδὺ θέρους δυνῶντι χιὼν ποτόν), a favorite image of Martial's.³⁴⁴ In the *Apophoreta*, Martial boils this image down into a series of objects involved in drinking snow or snow-chilled water (*colum nivarium* 14.103, *saccus nivarius* 14.104, *lagonae nivariae* 14.116-8). Martial effectively transforms Asclepiades' sweet (ἡδὺ) experience into a commodity to be exchanged, and, as poem 14.116 reveals, for certain segments of Martial's contemporary audience, this commodity is not even particularly sweet. For someone accustomed to top-shelf wine, he claims, the *decoctae... frigus aquae* (rendered *nobile*, perhaps, through its aged literary pedigree?) is pointless.³⁴⁵

In the *Xenia*, we find a similar recontextualization of an Asclepiadean ideal, specifically the second element of his priamel, the welcome appearance of the εἰαρινὸν Στέφανον, equivalent to the *Corona borealis* constellation, at winter's end.³⁴⁶ Leaving

³⁴⁴ Cf. e.g. 5.64.2 *aestivas... nives*.

³⁴⁵ The nobility of this decocted water probably also recalls the exclusive *decocta Neronis*; for an interesting look at Nero's water through the lens of Neronian poetry, see E. Gowers (1994) "Persius and the decoction of Nero" in J. Elsner and J. Masters (eds.) *Reflections of Nero: culture, history, & representation*. Chapel Hill.

³⁴⁶ On the constellation's identity, see Sens (2010) ad. loc.

aside for the time being Martial's plaintive ode on the boy Earinus, which (as I mentioned in my first chapter) includes a wry jab at Greek poets for using the same spelling Asclepiades does here (*dicunt Eiarinon tamen poetae, / sed Graeci, quibus est nihil negatum* 9.11.13-4), the final poem of the *Xenia* plays with the same images of winter, spring, and *coronae* found in Asclepiades' priamel. There is also a fundamental change in context: gone is the humble sailor, replaced by the omnipotent Caesar. For Martial, Caesar's influence overrides the natural order of things as represented by Asclepiades' epigram – the springtime Garland (εἰαρινὸν Στέφανον) is first commodified into *coronae roseae* and then wrenched from its springtime context, perhaps with a sly glance at its Asclepiadean roots (*quondam veris erat*). Further, if we consider Martial's *corona* as a Στέφανος, as my discussion here encourages us to do, it is difficult to resist a metapoetic interpretation, given the rise of the Στέφανος as a collection of epigrams starting in the first century BCE, as well as Martial's emphatic placement of poem 13.127 at the end of the *Xenia*. Could Martial be commenting obliquely on how epigrams have changed between the Hellenistic and the Flavian periods (*quondam* versus *nunc*)? The difference, of course, is the emperor – *nunc tua facta rosa est*. Where once epigram belonged to nature, it now belongs to Caesar.³⁴⁷

I turn finally to the capstone of Asclepiades' priamel, the supremacy of erotic love, embodied by a single cloak (μία... χλαῖνα) concealing two lovers. Martial's *Apophoreta* is replete with bedding, formal and informal, but his epigram on *cubicularia gausapina* (coarse woolen bedspread) offers an especially pointed comment on the Asclepiadean ideal. Whether you're covered by a cloak (χλαῖνα) or a regal purple blanket (*stragula*

³⁴⁷ See epigram 8.82 for similar garland imagery.

purpureis... villosa tapetis) makes no difference, if your lover is uncooperative or else unsatisfying (*quid prodest, si te congelat uxor anus?*). With this poem, Martial takes Asclepiades' idealized depiction of sex and drags it down to a rather bleak (if amusing) reality.

The point of this analysis has been to show how Martial has transformed the three elements of Asclepiades' priamel, whether intentionally or not, into three objects for consumption, and in so doing he has undermined all three of them; according to Martial, an Asclepiadean priamel just doesn't work in a world of fine wines, frigid wives, and emperors. Readers should turn instead to Martial himself, a modern-day Asclepiades, if they wish to see a more realistic kind of erotic poetry, one that is relevant to life in (Martial's) Rome.

Asclepiades' application of erotic themes to the distinct form of epigram made him an innovator, and so it should come as no surprise that echoes of his work appear throughout Martial's corpus. The Latin poet transforms his predecessor's innovation into something over which he himself has full control, whether by asserting his mastery over Asclepiades' love lessons, as we saw in the first reading, or by boiling down Asclepiadean imagery to physical items intended for distribution to his dinner guests, as shown by the second reading (and as I discussed in my first chapter with the more obviously literary poems on Homer from the *Apophoreta*). In short, then, Martial playfully undermines Asclepiades' literary authority, and in the process assumes a position of superiority for himself.

II. Martial's Posidippus

I will next consider one of Asclepiades' contemporaries and friends/rivals, Posidippus, best known for his prominence on the recently-discovered Milan papyrus (the "New" Posidippus), but also the author of a number of erotic epigrams preserved in the Greek Anthology (the "Old" Posidippus).³⁴⁸ It is in light of these earlier Posidippian poems that I will consider how Martial is heir to a Greek epigrammatic tradition wherein erotic poetry is closely linked with the symposium, and how he recontextualizes and problematizes this tradition with reference to the Roman *cena*.³⁴⁹

Gutzwiller suggests that Posidippus' erotic epigrams (16 in total from the Greek Anthology, none of which are included on the Milan papyrus) were collected into a book in order to complement Asclepiades' earlier collection. The narrator of Posidippus' poems, according to Gutzwiller, is on the whole much more resistant to the woes of love than the tormented lover of Asclepiades – he "manages erotic experience through objective resistance to emotional torment."³⁵⁰ In truth, this resistance is only sometimes successful, usually in the absence of wine, and when it fails, the frustrated lover's apparent objectivity seems to waver; but in general the narrator's canny analysis of his erotic situation is indeed striking, especially given the inherently personal (and thus emotional) nature of these kinds of epigrams. Posidippus' capacity for dispassionate examination is supported by the Milanese poems, which, being written mainly about

³⁴⁸ Work on Posidippus unsurprisingly took off after the Milan papyrus (e.g. Gutzwiller 1998: 150-70, 2005; Acosta-Hughes et al. 2004).

³⁴⁹ N. Zorzetti (1990) "The carmina convivalia" attempts to trace the sympotic origins of Roman poetry, aligning the Greek and Roman traditions on parallel planes. J. D'Arms (1990) "The Roman convivium and the idea of equality" compares private and public (i.e. state-sponsored) convivia during the reign of Domitian; he ultimately blurs the distinction between the two, instead focusing on the versatility found in adapting a Greek practice for a much broader Roman context. Both of these essays are from O. Murray (ed.) (1990) *Symptotica: A Symposium on the Symposium*. Oxford.

³⁵⁰ Gutzwiller (1998) 128.

made famous by the Greeks, but also on a linguistic level: excepting proper names, there are no fewer than seven words of Greek origin throughout the epigram, including the very first, *archetypis*. Most of the other Greek words refer to various kinds of drinking vessels or the decorations thereupon: *cymbia* (2), *cratere* (7), *scyphus* (11), *toreumata* (15), *calathis* (16).³⁵² An intriguing exception to this pattern, however, is the word *stemmata* (3), which here means “pedigree” but more commonly means “garland,” perhaps a clever reference to Martial’s own *archetypon*, Meleager’s *Garland*.³⁵³ Such an analogy breaks down as the poem continues, since the silverware has an epic (rather than epigrammatic) pedigree, but by flagging, however briefly, the presence of Greek epigram in the first few lines, in combination with peppering Greek words throughout, Martial sensitizes the reader to an alternate metapoetic reading for the rest of the poem.

In order to get at the specifics of such a reading, it will now be useful to consider how Posidippus uses the imagery of wine or wine cups in association with poetry, or more precisely, poetic ‘genealogy’ (AP 12.168):

Ναννοῦς καὶ Λύδης ἐπίχει δύο καὶ φιλεράστου
 Μιμνέρμου καὶ τοῦ σώφρονος Ἀντιμάχου·
 συγκέρασον τὸν πέμπτον ἐμοῦ, τὸν δ’ ἕκτον „Ἐκάστου,”
 Ἡλιόδωρ’, εἵπας, „ὅστις ἐρῶν ἔτυχεν.”
 ἔβδομον Ἡσιόδου, τὸν δ’ ὀγδοὺν εἶπον Ὀμήρου,
 τὸν δ’ ἑνατὸν Μουσῶν, Μνημοσύνης δέκατον.
 μεστὸν ὑπὲρ χεῖλους πίομαι, Κύπρι· τάλλα δ’ Ἔρωτες
 νήφοντ’, οἰνωθέντ’ οὐχὶ ῥλίην ἄχαριν.

Pour two shots of Nanno and Lyde, and two of Mimnermus, friend to lovers, and moderate Antimachus; Heliodorus, mix in a fifth of myself, and a sixth, saying, “This one’s for anybody who’s happened to love.” Say the seventh is Hesiod’s, and the eighth Homer’s, and the ninth the Muses’, the tenth Mnemosyne’s. I’ll drink it filled past the brim, Cypris. And besides, Erotes, whether it’s water or wine, it isn’t at all unpleasant.

³⁵² On the profound ignorance of Euctus, especially as regards his tableware, see Watson (1998) and Watson and Watson (2003) 205.

³⁵³ The adjective *furiosus* when applied to Meleager’s anthology is not the most flattering descriptor, and the most learned of Martial’s readers would no doubt have found this amusing.

Gutzwiller justifiably sees this as a programmatic poem, possibly coming at the end of Posidippus' collection.³⁵⁴ There is much that could be said about this epigram in its own right, but most important for the purposes of the current study is the fact that the poet uses the metaphor of wine mixing to characterize his relationship with his predecessors, both ancient and recent.³⁵⁵ Martial works with a similar range of imagery in *Ep.* 8.6, where, like Posidippus, he intricately associates wine with poetry (myth and epic in particular) in the process of insulting his host Euctus. On one level, of course, the insult is simple: Euctus is constantly boasting about the supposedly mythological pedigree of his silverware, but he doesn't bother to serve his guests old (i.e. good) wine to match the cups.

At the same time, however, if we take Posidippus' metaphor into consideration, Martial's remarks take on added meaning. In the Posidippan poem, the narrator fills his wine cup with equal parts old (Homer, Hesiod, Mimnermus/Nanno) and new (Antimachus/Lyde, Heliodorus, himself) poets, the result of which is a pleasant drink. But Martial in *Ep.* 8.6 contorts this imagery into a strikingly different scenario. First, he boils down Posidippus' multiplicity of poets to a series of mythic allusions, and these do not fill the cups, but are rather engraved upon the cups themselves. Then, Martial transforms the Posidippan juxtaposition of old and new poets into a comic riff on the 'old wine in new bottles' *topos*: the punchline of the poem makes this clear, in that Euctus' wine is the Astyanax to his wine cups' Priam; moreover, whatever wine Euctus does serve

³⁵⁴ Gutzwiller (1998) 162-3.

³⁵⁵ Francesca Angiò suggests that the erotic/sympotic context is linked to a poetic context through the (disputed) word ἄχαπν, which invokes the loaded concept of χάρις in poetry. Whether or not this argument holds up, her conclusion, that Posidippus is (in an understated way) favorably comparing himself to the best qualities of poets old and new, remains convincing. F. Angiò (2003) "Posidippo di Pella, Ep. IX, 3086-3093 Gow-Page (Anth. Pal. XII 168)" in *MH* 60: 6-21.

will ultimately (and ironically) become musty with age (*mucida* 4) thanks to his incessant talking and the wine's poor quality. While funny in and of itself, this appropriation of the 'wine as poetry' motif also invites a metapoetic approach to Martial's epigram. In one sense, he is casting Euctus as a bad poet whose obsession with superficial epic trappings (the silverware) does nothing to disguise the fact that his poetry (the wine) is childish and terrible. This would align with Martial's criticism elsewhere of unskilled poetasters who inflict their bad verses on dinner guests. In another sense, Martial is reflecting on his own approach to poetry – is he using his Greek and (especially) Latin ancestors only superficially, while in fact creating a kind of poetry that is new (*Astyanacta*)? The context of this epigram suggests that such novelty is not necessarily a good thing, which might make this an example of Martial's comic self-deprecation. Such readings are necessarily speculative, but they effectively point out how the sympotic elements of Posidippus' poetry can and should encourage us to think about Martial in different ways.

It is necessary to remember, however, that Posidippus intimately connects wine and the symposium with *eros*, and so we must also consider how his erotic epigrams may influence those of Martial. The following poem from the Greek Anthology is probably programmatic to Posidippus' work (*AP* 5.134):³⁵⁶

Κεκροπί, ραῖνε, λάγυνε, πολύδροσον ικμάδα Βάκχου,
 ραῖνε, δροσιζέσθω συμβολικὴ πρόποσις.
 σιγάσθω Ζήνων ὁ σοφὸς κύκνος ἅ τε Κλεάνθους
 μοῦσα· μέλοι δ' ἡμῖν ὁ γλυκύπικρος Ἔρως.

Sprinkle, Cecropian flask, sprinkle the dewy moisture of Bacchus – let my share of the toast be made. Let the wise swan Zeno and the Muse of Cleanthes be silent; may bittersweet love instead be our concern.

The narrator here rejects the Stoics' conventional restraint (alcoholic and emotional) in

³⁵⁶ On the programmatic status of this poem and its placement with the Posidippian book, see Gutzwiller (1998) 157-8.

favor of the ups and downs of γλυκύπικρος Ἔρως, which he ties inextricably to wine (ικμάδα Βάκχου).³⁵⁷ Posidippus frames his thematic preference as a toast (πρόποσις) which seems to support the recent scholarly consensus that this poem likely occupied a position toward the beginning of a collection of love epigrams.³⁵⁸ A poem toward the beginning of Martial's eleventh book offers a few noteworthy parallels (*Ep.* 11.6). He begins by establishing the book's Saturnalian context with a request to *pilleata Roma* (4): *versu ludere non laborioso* ("to sport in un-toilsome verse," 3). After Rome grants Martial her permission, his attention shifts to Dindymus, a favored slave boy and cupbearer (9-16):

misce dimidios, puer, trientes,
quales Pythagoras dabat Neroni,
misce, Dindyme, sed frequentiores:
possum nil ego sobrius; bibenti
succurrent mihi quindecim poetae.
da nunc basia, sed Catulliana:
quae si tot fuerint, quot ille dixit,
donabo tibi Passerem Catulli.

Mix me a double shot, boy, the kind that Pythagoras used to give to Nero;³⁵⁹ mix, Dindyme, and keep them coming. I can't do anything sober, but fifteen poets will rush to my aid if I'm drunk. Now give me kisses – Catullan kisses – and if I get as many as he wrote about, I'll give *you* Catullus' sparrow.

There is no guarantee that these lines are a direct imitation of Posidippus' epigram, but their sympotic-erotic themes, in combination with the poem's programmatic status and early placement in Martial's book, encourage comparison. While the only linguistic parallel is the anaphora in both epigrams of ῥαῖνε... ῥαῖνε and *misce... misce*, this should attune the reader's senses to the possibility of further connections between the two poems. The proper names in particular call attention to themselves, and Posidippus'

³⁵⁷ Garrison (1978: 6-7) suggests that Posidippus is poking fun at the "stiff-necked" Hellenistic philosophical climate, wherein Stoics, along with Epicureans and Cynics, strongly disapproved of erotic love.

³⁵⁸ Gutzwiller (1998) 157-9; see also J.G. Montes Cala (1999) "Sobre la naturaleza de la poesía en el simposio: AP V 134 (Posidipo)" in *ExcPhil* 9: 101-9.

³⁵⁹ According to Tacitus (*Ann.* 15.38), the freedman Pythagoras took Nero to wife, with a full-fledged wedding.

mention of the Stoic philosophers Zeno and Cleanthes is matched by Martial's reference to Nero's 'husband' Pythagoras, who (perhaps not by coincidence) himself shares a name with a Greek philosopher.³⁶⁰ The drastic difference between Posidippus' esteemed Stoics, however subtly he might be mocking them, and Martial's Neronian pervert, however favorably he might be comparing him to Dindymus, immediately reframes – or debases – the Hellenistic epigram within the sordid and obscene context of the Saturnalia. The ends of both poems reveal another facet of Martial's comic debasement: Posidippus concludes with an allusion to Sappho's famous description of Ἔρως as γλυκύπικρον ὄρπετον (Bergk 40), while Martial alludes to Catullus' equally famed *basia* (Cat. 5) and *Passer* (Cat. 2 and 3) poems (and Catullus is an appropriate Latin analog for Sappho, given his famous translation of Sappho 31).³⁶¹ The largest difference is Martial's blatant sexualization of his model, as he turns the *passer* into a crude double entendre for *mentula* (*donabo tibi Passerem Catulli*). In other words, he does explicitly with his Latin epigrammatic predecessor the same thing that he does implicitly with his Greek one: he plunges him into the depths of obscenity. The effect, as we have seen, is to prompt the reader to reevaluate Martial's models in the context of his literary world, over which he can claim complete control.

III. Martial's Callimachus

The next author I will discuss is Callimachus, whose impact on genres of slight poetry

³⁶⁰ Nero's Pythagoras appears in Tacitus (15.37) and Dio (62.28). Suetonius (*Nero* 29) refers instead to the freedman 'Doryphorus.'

³⁶¹ Whether the *passer* is itself an allusion to Posidippus' description of Zeno as ὁ σοφὸς κύκνος is difficult to say, but it is not outside the realm of possibility.

like epigram cannot be underestimated.³⁶² For the purposes of this chapter I will focus primarily on Callimachus' erotic epigrams and how they reflect the attitudes of a lover who, as Gutzwiller observes, embraces "personal reserve [and] striv[es] after the refined and the exclusive."³⁶³ As we shall see, Callimachus aligns these erotic sensibilities very closely with the poetic refinement for which he is so well known, and many of his love poems reward metapoetic readings. Martial seems to be aware of this alignment, but is suspicious of so readily equating erotic and poetic selectivity; accordingly, he fosters this same suspicion in his audience, both through direct allusions to Callimachus himself and by routinely giving examples of erotic exclusivity gone awry.

An example of the former approach can be found in Martial's response to the following poem, perhaps the first in Callimachus' original collection of epigrams (63 of which survive). It takes the form of an anecdote about the Mitylenean sage Pittacus, who uses the example of boys spinning tops to offer advice on marrying above one's station (*AP* 7.89 = 1 Pf.):

Ξεῖνος Ἀταρνεΐτης τις ἀνείρετο Πιττακὸν οὕτω
τὸν Μυτιληναῖον, παῖδα τὸν Ὑρράδιον·
'ἄττα γέρον, δοιός με καλεῖ γάμος· ἡ μία μὲν δὴ
νύμφη καὶ πλούτῳ καὶ γενεῇ κατ' ἐμέ,
ἡ δ' ἑτέρη προβέβηκε. τί λώϊον; εἰ δ' ἄγε σύμ μοι 5
βούλευσον, ποτέρην εἰς ὑμέναιον ἄγω.'
εἶπεν· ὁ δὲ σκίπωνα γεροντικὸν ὄπλον ἀείρας·
'ἦνίδε κεῖνοί σοι πᾶν ἐρέουσιν ἔπος.'
οἱ δ' ἄρ' ὑπὸ πληγῇσι θοᾷς βέμβικας ἔχοντες
ἔστρεφον εὐρείῃ παῖδες ἐνὶ τριόδῳ. 10
'κείνων ἔρχεο', φησί, 'μετ' ἵχνια.' χὼ μὲν ἐπέστη
πλησίον· οἱ δ' ἔλεγον· 'τὴν κατὰ σαυτὸν ἔλα.'
ταῦτ' αἶων ὁ ξεῖνος ἐφείσατο μείζονος οἴκου

³⁶² The scholarship on Callimachus is vast, but relevant to this project are Knox (2006), which detects an allusion to the beginning of the *Aetia* in Martial's *Ep.* 1.107; Fain (2008), a monograph tracing the development of epigrammatic formal composition from pre-Hellenistic epigram through Callimachus, Catullus, and Martial; and Nelis (2012), which relates the work of Catullus to Callimachean (and more broadly Alexandrian) poetry in ways similar to my approach here. Cameron (1995) is of course an invaluable source for contextualizing Callimachus' work, and his final chapter does much to set the stage for the kinds of readings I am conducting here.

³⁶³ Gutzwiller 1998: 221.

δράξασθαι, παίδων κληδόνα συνθέμενος.
 τὴν δ' ὀλίγην ὡς κείνος ἐξ οἰκίον ἤγετο νύμφην, 15
 οὕτω καὶ σύ, Δίῳ, τὴν κατὰ σαυτὸν ἔλα.

A certain stranger from Atarneus asked the Mytilinean sage Pittacus, son of Hyrras, “Venerable elder, I must pick between two marriages: the one bride is my equal in wealth and rank, while the other is my superior. Which is better? Please, advise me which girl I should marry.” And Pittacus, lifting up his staff, an old man’s weapon, replied, “Look here, these boys will give you all the advice you need.” The boys were using blows to keep their tops swiftly spinning in the wide crossroads. “Follow,” he said, “in their footsteps.” So the stranger stood closer as the boys kept exclaiming, “Stay in your lane.” When he heard this, the stranger decided against pursuing the higher marriage, since he understood the boys’ message. And just as that man led the poorer bride into his house, so too should you, Dion, stay in your lane.

Pittacus’ lesson comes from the mouths of the boys themselves: τὴν κατὰ σαυτὸν ἔλα

(12). In other words, a man should not marry outside his station, especially if his

potential wife is his social better. Martial comes up against this very issue in his eighth

book, although he seems already to have made up his mind (*Ep.* 8.12):

Uxorem quare locupletem ducere nolim
 quaeritis? uxori nubere nolo meae.
 inferior matrona suo sit, Prisce, marito:
 non aliter fiunt femina virque pares.

You ask why I don’t want to marry a rich wife? I don’t want my wife to carry *me* over the threshold. Let the matron be inferior to her husband, Priscus: it’s the only way the man and woman can be equal.

The framing of the epigram, which is only a quarter the length of Callimachus’, is a neat reimagining of the Callimachean poem – the speaker (henceforth called ‘Martial’ for simplicity’s sake) effectively assumes Pittacus’ role by sharing sage marital knowledge with an enquiring interlocutor. Unlike Pittacus, of course, Martial teaches his lesson directly, without metaphor. Such directness enables Martial to engage more vividly with his subject matter, especially in the first couplet, where words like *nolim*, *nolo*, and *meae* express a strong personal preference. These personal touches in the first two lines give added punch to the impersonal gnomic advice of the second couplet, an effect which is basically the reverse of Callimachus’ epigram, where the first part of the poem (1-14) is an impersonal anecdote, and only in the final couplet (15-6) does the speaker directly

engage his audience – or rather Dion, his addressee – in the second person.

Formal matters aside, the content of Martial's lesson is worth comparing closely with that of Pittacus. On one level, the message is the same: do not marry a woman richer than you are. Of course, in Callimachus' poem it is enough to marry instead a wife who is your equal (κατ' ἐμέ, κατὰ σαντόν). Martial too agrees that husband and wife should be equal (*femina virque pares* 4), but suggests that the only way such a thing is possible is to marry an *inferior matrona* (3). This joke, itself an amusing take on husband-wife power relations, introduces an added dimension to the Callimachean poem. Callimachus presents a situation where there are two options for marriage: a wife either superior or equal in wealth and station (πλούτῳ καὶ γενεῇ 4). Martial suggests that the more important question is whether one's wife is one's superior or equal in the endless power struggle of the marriage, and that these two options do not map precisely onto the Callimachean ones. In effect Martial is revising Pittacus' advice (the old-fashioned advice of one who carries a γεροντικὸν ὄπλον, and even older still if we imagine Martial's addressee "Priscus" as an allusion to his Callimachean model) to align with married life as it 'really' is. After all, for Martial, a wife is impossibly hard to handle: she can be an adulteress (as at *Ep.* 3.92 and 10.40, both on Martial's fictional wife), a cold fish in bed (cf. 11.104: *si te delectat gravitas, Lucretia toto / sis licet usque die: Laida nocte volo*, "If you like seriousness, you can be a Lucretia all day long: but at night I want a Lais"), or even her husband's murderer (cf. 9.15, on Chloe, whose seven spouses mysteriously perished, as discussed in my previous chapter, or 9.78, on the poisoner Galla). Martial considers marriage to be unstable at best and perilous at worst, often worth avoiding or escaping at any cost (e.g. 4.24: *omnes quas habuit, Fabiane, Lycoris*

amicas / extulit: uxori fiat amica meae, “Lycoris has buried every friend she’s ever had, Fabianus: let her make friends with my wife”).³⁶⁴ And so it makes sense that he tries to even the odds by advocating an *inferior matrona* – only then does the husband stand a chance of keeping his wife under control.

Martial is calling Callimachus’ erotic sensibilities into question by producing poems like these that turn them on their head, but at the same time throughout the *Epigrams* he more or less implicitly endorses a Callimachean style of poetic composition. In comparing the following pair of epigrams, we will see Martial’s skeptical reaction to Callimachus’ apparent amalgamation of poetic and erotic exclusivity. Consider first the following well-known Callimachean poem (*AP* 12.43 = 28 Pf.):

Ἐχθαίρω τὸ ποίημα τὸ κυκλικόν, οὐδὲ κελεύθῳ
χαίρω, τίς πολλοὺς ὧδε καὶ ὧδε φέρει·
μισέω καὶ περίφοιτον ἐρώμενον, οὐδ’ ἀπὸ κρήνης
πίνω· σικχαίνω πάντα τὰ δημόσια.
Λυσανίη, σὺ δὲ ναίχι καλὸς καλός—ἀλλὰ πρὶν εἰπεῖν
τοῦτο σαφῶς Ἦχώ φησί τις· ‘ἄλλος ἔχει.’

I hate the cyclic poem, and I take no pleasure in a road that brings many people here and there. I hate a roaming beloved as well, nor do I drink from a common fountain. I despise all things public. Lysanias, you are without a doubt beautiful, beautiful – but before the words escape my mouth, an echo clearly says, “He is someone else’s.”

This epigram is as much a statement of Callimachean ‘erotics’ as a statement of poetics.

Here, the poet eschews πάντα τὰ δημόσια (4), which includes wandering (περίφοιτον 3)

lovers who belong to someone else. Martial’s standards, at least in the following

epigram, seem somewhat different (*Ep.* 9.32):

Hanc volo, quae facilis, quae palliolata vagatur,
hanc volo, quae puero iam dedit ante meo,
hanc volo, quam redimit totam denarius alter,
hanc volo, quae pariter sufficit una tribus.
poscentem nummos et grandia verba sonantem

³⁶⁴ An important exception to this trend are Martial’s epithalamia, which happily celebrate the institution of marriage and the moral uprightness of both husband and wife. Cf. e.g. *Ep.* 4.13, 7.69, 10.38, 12.42.

possideat crassae mentula Burdigalae.

I want a girl who's easy, one who wanders around in a little Greek cloak; I want a girl who's already given it up to my slave; I want a girl who sells herself (in full) for a couple of denarii; I want a girl who by herself gives three men a run for their money. As for the girl who demands cash and talks big, let coarse Burdigala's dick have that one.

On a basic level, there is a broad structural similarity linking this epigram with Callimachus': both poems begin with a series of four first person present verbs expressing the narrator's preferences (Ἐχθαίρω... χαίρω... μισέω... πίνω / *hanc volo... volo... volo... volo*) and conclude with a couplet shifting the focus from the narrator to someone else (Lysanias and his lover / the greedy girl and her hypothetical Gaul). These parallels encourage deeper analysis of the two poems, and at first glance, it appears that Martial is taking up a position diametrically opposed to that of Callimachus, in ways that specifically respond to the earlier poem. Whereas Callimachus explicitly despises the wandering lover (μισέω... περίφοιτον ἐρώμενον 3), Martial explicitly desires one (*hanc volo... quae palliolata vagatur* 1), and one in Greek dress no less (a *pallium* is technically a Greek cloak). And while Callimachus hates what is common (σικχαίνω πάντα τὰ δημόσια 4), Martial's ideal lover is exceedingly common, making herself cheaply available to all comers. The close of the second couplet offers the most emphatic expression of this point (*pariter sufficit una tribus* 4), a comic magnification of Callimachus' ἄλλος ἔχει (6) – Martial has no qualms about another man having his woman, and he even adds a third into the mix. It seems then, that Martial has rejected Callimachean erotics wholesale.

But the final couplet, as so often in Martial, changes everything. Here, the poet gives an example of the kind of girl he could do without, evidently one who boasts and demands high pay for her services, suitable only for some idiot Gaul. This seems like a

rather flat culmination for the preceding priamel, at least until we consider the couplet in Callimachean terms. Martial rejects a woman with booming voice (*grandia verba sonantem* 5), a phrase that could easily be applied to epic poetry.³⁶⁵ The Gaul, metonymically equated with Burdigala (modern Bordeaux), is described as *crassa*, a term used elsewhere by Martial to describe excessively long poetry.³⁶⁶ Even the mention of Burdigala, the site of a battle during the Cimbrian War, might be an oblique hint at the ever-popular genre of historical epic. All of this evidence suggests, then, that Martial's last couplet is in fact a comic rejection of epic, a statement of Callimachean poetics hidden behind a thin (and absurd) veil of obscenity.³⁶⁷ The question then becomes how Martial can in the same poem reject Callimachus' standards for a lover and embrace his standards for poetry. I would argue that Martial is poking fun at Callimachus's epigram by claiming that erotic and poetic exclusivity are not the same thing. In fact, according to Martial, such an analogy can be utterly ridiculous, and the punchline of his poem, the obscene reworking of Callimachus' rejection of epic, serves to underscore this point.

But according to Martial, even erotic exclusivity alone is sometimes worth ridiculing, especially when he perceives it to be misguided. Callimachus may have opened himself to such an accusation in the following love epigram (AP 12.51 = 29 Pf.):

ἔγχει καὶ πάλιν εἰπὲ 'Διοκλέος'. οὐδ' Ἀχελῷος
 κείνου τῶν ἱερῶν αἰσθάνεται κυάθων.
 καλὸς ὁ παῖς, Ἀχελῷε, λίην καλός, εἰ δέ τις οὐχί
 φησὶν, ἐπισταίμην μούνοσ' ἐγὼ τὰ καλά.

³⁶⁵ See poem 9.50 in this same book, a direct critique of a contemporary epic poet: *sed tu bis senis grandia libris / qui scribis Priami proelia...*

³⁶⁶ 5.78.25: *nec crassum dominus leget volumen*. Reference might also be made to Callimachus' description of the Lyde of Antimachus as *παχύ* (fr. 398).

³⁶⁷ Callimachus' rejection of long poetry, and epic in particular, is well supported by his surviving work, but by the Roman period the notion of 'Callimachean poetics' (that is, literary elitism) was probably based on a relatively narrow reading of his programmatic passages and not necessarily representative of his breadth as a poet. See Hunter (2006).

Fill my cup and say it again: “Diocles!” The river Achelous is unaware of that one’s sacred cups. The boy is beautiful, Achelous, exceedingly beautiful. And if anyone disagrees, well, I’m content to be the only true connoisseur of beauty.

This poem makes two points in as many couplets. The first point may be obscure to a modern reader: the patron deity of Achelous, the largest river in Greece, was (according to the historian Ephorus) commonly invoked in oaths and sacrifices; as such, he would have been well-acquainted with all manner of gods, here represented by ἱερῶν κυάθων; but Callimachus makes his toast to an unknown ‘deity’ – his beloved, the intoxicating Diocles.³⁶⁸ This introduces the notion of subjective divinity, which is transformed in the second couplet into a comment on erotic subjectivity: Callimachus acknowledges the possibility that others might not find Diocles to be καλός, but remains convinced that his evaluation is the only correct one. Martial, meanwhile, writes two epigrams in his third book on men with similarly unconventional love interests, and his portrayal is uniformly unflattering. Consider his scorn of the gerontophile Bassus in the following poem (*Ep.* 3.76):

arrigis ad vetulas, fastidis, Basse, puellas,
nec formosa tibi, sed moritura placet.
hic, rogo, non furor est, non haec est mentula demens?
cum possis Hecaben, non potes Andromachen!

You get it up for old women, Bassus, you shrink from young girls – you don’t like a beautiful woman, but rather one who’s on death’s door. I ask you, is this not lunacy? Is this not a cock-eyed cock? You can do Hecuba, but you can’t do Andromache!

Martial ridicules Bassus’ preference for elderly women as a kind of madness (*furor*), and in particular a perversion of sexual norms (wittily conveyed via the pun *mentula demens*).³⁶⁹ Bassus, then, occupies a position much like that of Callimachus’ narrator:

³⁶⁸ For an explanation of the poem’s religious context, see W. M. Clarke (1981) “Achelous in Anthologia Palatina 12. 51 (Callimachus)” in *CP* 76: 297-300.

³⁶⁹ Watson and Watson (2003: 221) point out that the sexual undesirability of older women was a common complaint in antiquity, from Aristophanes (e.g. *Eccl.* 878ff.) to Horace (*Carm.* 4.13).

where the latter finds beauty in the unconventional, the former finds sex appeal. Apart from the irreverent transformation of τὰ καλὰ into *mentula*, the key difference here is that Martial quite vigorously assumes the role of Callimachus' hypothetical naysayer (εἰ δέ τις οὐχί / φησί). Such an adversative stance is not limited to this epigram, as we can see from the following distich earlier in book 3 (*Ep.* 3.8): "*Thaïda Quintus amat.*" *quam Thaïda?* "*Thaïda luscam.*" / *unum oculum Thaïs non habet, ille duos* ("Quintus loves Thais." Which Thais? "One-eyed Thais." Thais is missing one eye, he's missing both).³⁷⁰ Once again, the poem's subject loves a girl whose physical appearance, according to Martial, should be repulsive. And just as he marvels at Bassus' *furor* in the previous poem, here he remarks on Quintus' willful blindness, jokingly comparing it to Thais' physical blindness.³⁷¹ In essence, Martial encourages his readers to reconsider Callimachean selectivity in light of the observations he makes in these epigrams – perhaps erotic exclusivity is in fact the product of a blind (or insane) fool's thirst for sexual gratification.

Amidst all this mockery of other people's misguided sexual preferences, we also find an epigram in which Martial's narrator is himself being extremely selective (*Ep.* 3.53):

et voltu poteram tuo carere
et collo manibusque cruribusque
et mammis natibusque clunibusque,
et, ne singula persequi laborem,
tota te poteram, Chloe, carere.

I could do without your face, and your neck and hands and legs, and and your breasts and haunches and

³⁷⁰ According to Watson and Watson (2003: 315), the dialogic form of this poem, uncommon in Martial, was frequently found in Greek dedicatory and sepulchral epigrams (e.g. Callimachus, *AP* 5.5 = 34 Pf.).

³⁷¹ 'Blind' love is nothing new in Latin poetry, and is memorably described by Lucretius in his fourth book (e.g. 4.1160-1): *nigra melichrus est, immunda et fetida acosmos, / caesia Palladium, nervosa et lignea dorcas...* ("the dusky girl is 'honey-dark,' the squalid and stinking one 'unadorned,' the grey-eyed one a 'little Pallas,' the sinewy one a 'gazelle'..."). Interestingly, Lucretius' terms of endearment are all in Greek, which perhaps implies a Greek propensity for love-blindness and aligns well with my argument here. Cf. V. Buchheit (1964) "*Amor caecus*" in *CM* 25: 129-37; Watson and Watson (2003) 314-5.

buttocks, and... rather than waste time going through specifics, I could do without you entirely, Chloe.

The humor of this poem resides in the fact that Martial has essentially created a mental checklist of the parts of Chloe's body. As he systematically evaluates each part's appeal from the top of her body to the bottom, he rules out one after another, eventually recognizing the pointlessness of his efforts: a checklist is unnecessary; he can just cross off Chloe altogether.³⁷² This poem is funny in its own right, and it surely interacts with the Latin erotic tradition, but it may also make a joking remark about what it means to be a truly selective (or "Callimachean") lover. Any such reading would obviously not be the epigram's main point, but even so, if we think about it in terms of the Callimachean context that infuses the two other poems we have seen from Book 3, this poem gains some added value. On some level, Martial might be parodying for his reader what happens when you're overly exclusive: your erotic options, much like Chloe, simply disappear.

For Martial, these habits of excluding the common and striving after the exotic cannot always exist in a vacuum: the following epigram complicates his depiction of erotic love by introducing the question of Roman identity (*Ep.* 7.30):

das Parthis, das Germanis, das, Caelia, Dacis,
nec Cilicum spernis Cappadocumque toros;
et tibi de Pharia Memphiticus urbe fututor
navigat, a rubris et niger Indus aquis;
nec recutitorum fugis inguina Iudaeorum,
nec te Sarmatico transit Alanus equo.
qua ratione facis, cum sis Romana puella,
quod Romana tibi mentula nulla placet?

You give it up to Parthians, Caelia, and Dacians, and Germans; you have no problem with Cilician and Cappadocian beds; Memphian fuckers sail to you from the city of Pharos, and dark Indian ones from ruddy waters; you don't flee the loins of circumcised Jews, and the Alan on his Sarmatian horse doesn't pass you

³⁷² Fusi (2006: 363) draws a useful comparison between this epigram and Cat. 86, in which the poet compares the all-around beauty Lesbia with a certain Quinta: *haec ego sic singula confiteor./ totum illud formosa nego* ("I admit that these individual qualities are beautiful, but their sum total is not.").

by. Why on earth, even though you're a Roman girl, does no Roman dick make you happy?

Caelia is an archetypal example of the licentious and sex-crazed female, a common stereotype in antiquity, but she in particular is guilty of an unusual and shameful preference: she will not sleep with Roman men.³⁷³ Appallingly (to Martial), she would rather enjoy the *mentulae* of the Roman empire's bitterest enemies – Parthians, Germans, Dacians – than those of her own countrymen. On one level, this is the same sort of misguided selectivity we have seen from the previous lovers, but Caelia's promiscuity also invites us to view her as a *beloved*, recalling Callimachus' remarks (μισέω καὶ περίφοιτον ἐρώμενον) and Martial's response to them (*hanc volo... quae palliolata vagatur*). Caelia is indisputably a wandering beloved of the type despised by Callimachus, but she is also abhorrent to Martial as well, because she wanders in the wrong direction – away from Romans like him.³⁷⁴ The Callimachean subtext invites a metapoetic reading in the same vein as we have considered above. What would it mean, in other words, for Caelia to represent poetry? Surely she is Latin (*Romana puella*), but she shuns Martial's chosen genre, the *Romana mentula*, both obscene and (as he would have us believe, despite my arguments to the contrary) exclusively Roman. Instead, she turns to foreign themes: the enemies of Rome, and those from the farthest reaches of the empire (Cilicians, Cappadocians, Egyptians, Jews) and beyond (Sarmatians, Indians). Consorting with these peoples would prompt tales of war, Roman domination, and far-flung travels, and these are the stuff of epic, not epigram. It would seem that, in this poem at least, Martial and Callimachus share some common ground: a wandering

³⁷³ For a brief summary of ancient sources describing female sexual appetites, in particular Ov. *Am.* 1.8.43 and Petr. 110.6-8, see Galán Vioque (2002) 214.

³⁷⁴ The scope of this wandering is uncertain: Caelia can certainly find representatives of all ethnicities in Rome itself, but her sex-driven travels may just as well bring her to the ends of the empire.

beloved who at the same time practices a misguided sort of exclusivity can appeal neither to Callimachus nor to Martial.

These readings have demonstrated Martial's nuanced subversion of the Callimachean approach to love. Although, like Callimachus, Martial embraces the concept of poetic λεπτότης and rejects the *grandia verba* of epic, he nevertheless takes pains to point out that this approach cannot be so easily applied to an amatory context, especially in the starkly realistic and morally bankrupt Roman world of the *Epigrams*. Martial has effectively taken Callimachean poetics to its logical conclusion by transforming poetic selectivity into overall snobbery, and snobbery, of course, is the natural enemy of a 'low' genre like epigram.³⁷⁵ The impression we get, as often, is one of studied ambivalence: Martial admires Callimachus as an important predecessor whose poetics informs his own, but he is also a rival whose opinions on love run contrary to Martial's, for whom love and poetry cannot be the same thing.

IV. Martial's Meleager

The final section of this chapter will consider the relationship between Martial and Meleager, compiler of the famous *Garland* and author of over one hundred poems in the Greek Anthology. Meleager's epigrams are scattered across the anthology as we now have it, but they possess a striking thematic consistency in that the vast majority are love poems. The breadth of his erotic themes, as that of Martial's, is substantial: he writes on relationships both heterosexual and homosexual, love objects both faithful and

³⁷⁵ Consider for instance Martial's warning to his book at *Ep.* 1.3: *maiores nusquam rhonchi: iuvenesque senesque / et pueri nasum rhinocerotis habent* ("nowhere are there greater snorts – youths, old men, boys, they all have the nose of a rhinoceros").

duplicitous, and an Eros both generous and cruel.³⁷⁶ Unsurprisingly, earlier erotic epigrammatists exerted a clear influence on Meleager's poetry, and he seems to call attention to this fact throughout the *Garland* by juxtaposing his own poems with those upon which they are modeled: the 'love as fire' motif, to name just one, appears not only in isolated epigrams but in the sequence *AP* 12.79-87, the core of which is a series of Meleager's own poems on the theme.³⁷⁷ In addition, then, to comparing specific erotic epigrams by Meleager and Martial, both of whom possess the kind of learned refinement we might expect from dedicated students of their genre, I will also devote some attention to how Meleager's role as an anthologist may have affected his composition. More precisely, I will consider the ways in which the process of combining disparate poems into a unified collection affects one's own poetic output, and how this might be reflected in the internal disparity of Martial's *Epigrams*, which suggests the mindset not only of a reader of anthologies, but of someone trying to give his own poetry books the appearance of a 'one-man anthology.'

I will first consider the ways in which Martial adapts and transforms a variety of Meleager's erotic themes – his playful subversion of specific Meleagrian epigrams is consonant with what we have already seen him do with the other Greek poets in this chapter. It is also important to realize that Meleager was himself heavily influenced by the work of his predecessors, which adds another dimension to his relationship with Martial, as in the case of the following sequence of poems, addressed to the all-seeing

³⁷⁶ Recent scholarship discusses Meleager as poet and/or anthologist in enlightening ways: cf. e.g. Cameron (1993), an exhaustive analysis of Meleager's anthologistic methodology; Gutzwiller (1997), which works to merge his two identities as poet and editor; (1998): 276-322, on which see the following note; (2006), on Meleager's self-fashioning as a *poeta doctus*; and Argentieri (2007), an article-length reprisal of the earlier work of Cameron and Gutzwiller (1998).

³⁷⁷ Gutzwiller (1998) 288-9. Gutzwiller devotes much of her sixth chapter to reconstructing the original organization of Meleager's *Garland*, and in the process invites consideration of what it means to be both poet and anthologist.

bedside lamp. The origin of this theme was probably a poem by Asclepiades (*AP* 5.7):

Λύχνε, σὲ γὰρ παρεοῦσα τρεῖς ὥμοσεν Ἡράκλεια
 ἥξειν κοῦχ ἥκει· λύχνε, σὺ δ', εἰ θεὸς εἶ,
 τὴν δολίην ἀπάμυνον· ὅταν φίλον ἔνδον ἔχουσα
 παίζῃ, ἀποσβεσθεὶς μηκέτι φῶς πάρεχε.

O lamp, in your presence Heracleia swore three times that she would come, and she didn't come. Lamp, if you are a god, punish the treacherous girl: whenever she frolics at home with a lover, go out and give them light no longer.

Meleager appropriates Asclepiades' image of the lamp as conspirator in a poem of his own, and its placement directly after the Asclepiadean epigram in the Greek Anthology suggests that it may have occupied the same position in Meleager's *Garland*.³⁷⁸ If this is the case, Meleager seems to have intentionally flagged his allusion to Asclepiades by placing his own epigram immediately after its model (*AP* 5.8):

Νύξ ἱερὴ καὶ λύχνε, συνίστορας οὔτινας ἄλλους
 ὅρκοις, ἀλλ' ὑμέας, εἰλόμεθ' ἀμφοτέρωι·
 χῶ μὲν ἐμὲ στέρξειν, κεῖνον δ' ἐγὼ οὔποτε λείψειν
 ὁμόσαμεν· κοινήν δ' εἶχετε μαρτυρίην.
 νῦν δ' ὁ μὲν ὅρκιά φησιν ἐν ὕδατι κεῖνα φέρεσθαι,
 λύχνε, σὺ δ' ἐν κόλποις αὐτὸν ὀρᾷς ἐτέρων.

O holy night and lamp, the two of us chose for our oaths no other confidantes than you: he swore to love me, and I never to leave him, and you both received our common testimony. But now he says that those oaths have been carried off in running water, and you, o lamp, see him in the embrace of others.

As in the Asclepiadean poem, here the lamp is present for the swearing of a false oath by the narrator's beloved. The main difference lies in the lover's reaction upon realizing that he has been slighted: whereas Asclepiades spitefully prays that the lamp exact revenge on his behalf by giving no light to Heracleia's treacherous dalliances, Meleager sadly resigns himself to the fact that the lamp will simply watch his beloved in the arms of other men. Needless to say, Asclepiades' curse would be doomed to failure anyway, given that a lamp has no divine powers, and even if it were somehow to extinguish itself, Heracleia

³⁷⁸ Gutzwiller (1998: 283ff.) makes a nuanced argument for "a sophisticated artistic design in which smaller rhythmic units based on alternation of authors and similarity of theme are combined to form larger segments organized by gender and by generalizing motifs," but oddly this poem is not included in the final structure which she proposes.

and her new lover would probably just continue their activities in the dark.³⁷⁹ Meleager, in adapting the Asclepiadean motif, seems to acknowledge the futility of his predecessor's prayer by reducing his own lamp to a powerless observer. In the *Apophoreta*, Martial continues this pattern of thematic transformation by cheekily contradicting Meleager: a watchful lamp is far from powerless (*Ep.* 14.39):

Dulcis conscia lectuli lucerna,
quidquid vis facias licet, tacebo.

I am a lamp, sweet confidante of your bed: feel free to do whatever you want, my lips are sealed.

For Martial, the bedside lamp's apparent inability to speak or act is intentional – the first-person perspective of the poem indicates that the lamp *can* speak, but as a trusted confidante of its owner, it *chooses* not to share his or her secrets. This image of the lamp as conspirator (*conscia*) seems to be borrowed directly from Meleager's epigram, in which the lamp is one of two συνίστορες (1). This allusion encourages the reader to reread the Meleagrean (and in turn the Asclepiadean) poem in Martial's terms: the lamps in the Greek poems are not helpless avengers of love lost, but rather accomplices of the cheaters. Meleager and Asclepiades, according to Martial, have been duped, and it is up to the Roman poet to set the record straight.

Martial's erotic epigrams also borrow mythological imagery from Meleager. In particular, Martial enjoys the motif of comparing young *eromenoi*, usually cupbearers, to Ganymede.³⁸⁰ The following example is typical (*Ep.* 11.26):

O mihi grata quies, o blanda, Telesphore, cura,
qualis in amplexu non fuit ante meo:
basia da nobis vetulo, puer, uda Falerno,
pocula da labris facta minora tuis.
addideris super haec Veneris si gaudia vera,

³⁷⁹ Cf. Cameron (1981) 283–4 and Gutzwiller (1998) 139.

³⁸⁰ This occurs especially in the later books, as at *Ep.* 9.11, 22, 25, 103; 10.66; 11.26 (below), 43.

esse negem melius cum Ganymede Iovi.

Telesphorus, my welcome respite, my alluring care, the likes of whom I have never before held in my embrace: give me kisses, boy, wet with aged Falernian; give me cups made lesser by your lips. If beyond these you add Venus' true pleasures, I would say that Jupiter is no better off with Ganymede.

Martial adopts a slightly more elevated tone in this poem than is his norm, invoking the language of Latin erotic (*blanda... cura* 1, *amplexu* 2, *basia* 3, *Veneris... gaudia* 5) and sympotic (*vetulo... Falerno* 3, *pocula* 4) poetry, instead of taking the obscene approach that we have seen in many of the previous epigrams – most noteworthy is his reference to sex as *gaudia Veneris*, which is unusually euphemistic for an author who typically revels in *mentulae* and *fututiones*. We have seen Martial on many occasions drag his Greek model into the depths of obscenity, but if the present poem is indeed modeled on a Greek one, we might expect a more subtle interaction between Martial and his predecessor.

While the Greek Anthology has no shortage of epigrams on Ganymede, the following, by Meleager, is particularly striking in light of Martial's poem (AP 12.133):³⁸¹

Διψῶν ὥς ἐφίλησα θέρευς ἀπαλόχροα παῖδα,
εἶπα τότ' αὐχμηρὰν δίψαν ἀποπροφυγών·
„Ζεῦ πάτερ, ἄρα φίλημα τὸ νεκτάρειον Γανυμήδευς
πίνειις, καὶ τόδε σοὶ χεῖλεσιν οἶνοχοεῖ;
καὶ γὰρ ἐγὼ τὸν καλὸν ἐν ἡθέοισι φιλήσας
Ἀντίοχον ψυχῆς ἡδὺ πέπωκα μέλι.”

When I was thirsty in the summer³⁸² and kissed the soft-skinned boy, afterwards, having escaped my parching thirst, I said, “Father Zeus, do you drink the nectarean kiss of Ganymede? Is this how he pours wine to your lips? To be sure, now that I have kissed Antiochus, beautiful among youths, I have drunk the sweet honey of the soul.”

There is of course a broad thematic similarity between this poem and *Ep.* 11.26, in that each narrator is comparing the kisses of his beloved to those that Zeus/Jupiter receives from Ganymede. But worth pointing out as well are some structural and linguistic parallels. Formally, the poems are comparable, but not identical: both are composed of

³⁸¹ Ganymede appears throughout the Anthology: e.g. AP 5.65; 12.37, 68-70, 194, 221.

³⁸² The allusion here to the priamel of Asclepiades' AP 5.169 is clear. Cf. Gow and Page (1965) ad loc.

three elegiac couplets; Meleager begins with a first-person narrative distich, then makes a direct address to Zeus (Ζεῦ πάτερ), and finally sums things up with an elegant conclusion; Martial too uses direct address, but this begins in the first couplet with a series of lovestruck epithets, and is renewed (*puer*) in the second couplet; he reserves the Jupiter-Ganymede allusion for the final lines. Linguistically, the epigrams are more closely linked: the vocative Ζεῦ πάτερ resembles the dual vocatives in Martial's first and second hexameters (*Telesphore... puer*); the fourth lines of both poems make direct reference to wine-pouring and lips – Meleager's χεῖλεσιν οἰνοχοεῖ is met by Martial's *pocula... labris facta minora*; in the final line, Martial may be having a bit of fun with Meleager's ψυχῆς... μέλι by using the similar-sounding adjective *melius*.

Given the likelihood that Martial's epigram intentionally alludes to Meleager's, we can consider some interesting interpretive possibilities. Even though Martial refrains from obscenity in this poem, as I have already mentioned, he still adds a sexual component (*Veneris... gaudia* 5) which is absent from the Meleagrean original. This is a more subtle version of Martial's typical practice of using obscene material to degenerate his predecessor: by writing clearly but euphemistically about sex in his poem, he invites the reader to take a closer look at Meleager's poem with a 'dirtier mind,' as it were. And indeed, a search for euphemism in *AP* 12.133 might suddenly reveal an obscene *double entendre* in Meleager's wine-drinking imagery. The main point of his poem is that to kiss (φιλέω) Antiochus is to quench one's thirst (δίψαν ἀποπροφυγών) by drinking the soul's sweet honey (ψυχῆς ἥδὺ πέπωκα μέλι). If we imagine, thanks to Martial's corrupting influence, a more extreme meaning for φιλέω – that is, “to engage in sexual intercourse”

rather than “to kiss” – the Meleagrean imagery takes on an entirely new sense.³⁸³ The narrator (‘Meleager’) changes from an affectionate lover to a satisfied *fellator*, and the ψυχῆς ἡδὺ... μέλι he claims to have drunk becomes something closer to Archilochus’ λευκὸν μένος.³⁸⁴ The effect of this change is remarkable: not only has Martial imposed an obscene reading onto Meleager’s poem, but he has cast the poet himself as a performer of fellatio. While this is not so much an aggressive attack by Martial on Meleager’s character as an irreverent reinterpretation of his predecessor’s work, the effect is the same: Martial is comically emasculating the Greek poet, much to the delight of his well-read audience. At the same time, a convenient side effect of this joke is to place Martial himself in a position of dominance – as he does with so many targets throughout the *Epigrams*, he has (quietly) exposed the hidden truth of Meleager’s sex life.

Interestingly, Martial attempts to surpass Meleager’s overtly-stated erotic preferences no less than he tries to expose the ‘hidden’ ones. Consider the following epigram, in which Meleager uses a priamel to express his preference for a certain boy (*AP* 12.94):

Τερπνὸς μὲν Διόδωρος, ἐν ὄμμασι δ’ Ἡράκλειτος,
 ἡδυεπὴς δὲ Δίων, ὀσφύϊ δ’ Οὐλιάδης.
 ἀλλὰ σὺ μὲν ψαύοις ἀπαλόχροος, ᾧ δέ, Φιλόκλεις,
 ἔμβλεπε, τῷ δὲ λάλει, τὸν δὲ ... τὸ λειπόμενον,
 ὥς γινῶς, οἷός ἐμός νόος ἄφθονος· ἦν δὲ Μυῖσκῳ
 λίχνος ἐπιβλέψης, μηκέτ’ ἴδοις τὸ καλόν.

Diodorus is pleasing, the spotlight’s always on Heraclitus, Dion speaks sweetly, Uliades has nice loins. Go ahead, Philocles: touch the one with the soft skin, gaze at another one, chat with another, and do... you-know-what... with another. This is just so you know how un-jealous my mind is. But if you get greedy and lay eyes on Myiscus, may you never know true beauty!

Martial likewise provides a list of boys in priamel fashion, but both the list and his conclusion are surprising, especially compared to Meleager’s poem (*Ep.* 12.75):

³⁸³ Hesychius (4th c. CE) identifies φιλέω as one of several euphemisms for sexual intercourse. Cf. Hsch. s.v. βαίνειν.

³⁸⁴ Sexual meanings for μέλι or ψυχή are not elsewhere attested, but this would not stop Martial from retrospectively coining a new type of innuendo. The Archilochus poem in question is the Cologne epode (196A [West] 30).

festinat Polytimus ad puellas;
 invitus puerum fatetur Hypnus;
 pastas glande natis habet Secundus;
 mollis Dindymus est, sed esse non vult;
 Amphion potuit puella nasci.
 horum delicias superbiamque
 et fastus querulos, Avite, malo,
 quam dotis mihi quinquies ducena.

Polytimus hurries to the girls; Hypnus unwillingly admits that he's a boy; Secundus has a rump nourished on acorns; Dindymus is delicate, although he wishes otherwise; Amphion could have been born a girl. Their charms, their pride, their scornful complaints – Avitus, I'd choose these over a million-sesterce dowry any day.

Martial, like Meleager, identifies five boys by name. But whereas Meleager focuses on the appealing physical characteristics of these boys (τερπνός, ἐν ὄμμασι, ἡδυεπής, etc.), Martial instead devotes his attention to the wide variety of troublesome mental qualities that they possess, in particular their unwillingness to submit to a pederastic relationship (*festinat... ad puellas, invitus puerum fatetur, mollis... esse non vult*). Martial's ironic twist at the end of the epigram is sharpened in light of Meleager's ending: Meleager willingly gives up the first four boys, provided that the fifth, Myiscus, be his alone; Martial, on the other hand, does not, as we might expect based on his model, eschew the other boys in favor of the last one, the *puella*-like Amphion, but rather he explains that he would gladly take all five over any female, even one from a wealthy family. The misogynistic joke is apparent, but Martial's allusion to the Meleagrean epigram adds some intertextual humor as well: Martial's taste in boys is far less selective than his predecessor's, and he would rather take all five boys than limit himself to just one, much less a woman. The effect of this observation is comparable to what we have seen with Callimachus, in that Martial seems to be taking an amusing jab at erotic exclusivity. In fact, he may well have had Callimachus in mind here, given that Meleager's poem itself alludes to Call. 29 Pf. (discussed above): Meleager's concluding curse, μηκέτ' ἴδοις τὸ

καλόν, clearly recalls Callimachus' prayer, ἐπισταίμην μούνοῦ ἐγὼ τὰ καλά. Martial, then, has once more playfully undermined Callimachean 'erotics,' this time as filtered through his anthologist Meleager.

Martial engages with this anthologistic facet of Meleager's work on a few occasions throughout the *Epigrams*. This should come as no surprise given that Martial and Meleager are on a basic level performing the same poetic task: compiling books of epigrams.³⁸⁵ The difference, of course, is that Meleager collects poems from various sources, whereas Martial's poems are all his own. Even so, the extent of Martial's thematic allusion to Meleager and earlier Greek epigrammatists, in combination with his protean, often self-contradictory, poetic personae, suggests that he might style himself as the creator of a single-author anthology, a concept that (as we might expect from Martial) is itself a contradiction in terms. While definitive proof for such an argument may be impossible to find, there are several poems in the *Epigrams* which offer promising approaches. For example, any reference to garlands (*coronae* or *serta*) in the context of poetry or books warrants careful consideration, given Meleager's composition of a metaphorical στέφανος.³⁸⁶ Two epigrams along these lines are especially rewarding. The first is an encomium addressed to a certain Liber, who in a later poem (*Ep.* 9.72) is revealed to be a Greek charioteer (*Ep.* 8.77):

Liber, amicorum dulcissima cura tuorum,
Liber, in aeterna vivere digne rosa,
si sapis, Assyrio semper tibi crinis amomo
splendeat et cingant florea serta caput;
candida nigrescant vetulo crystalla Falerno
et caleat blando mollis amore torus.

³⁸⁵ Similar work has been done with Latin elegy and Hellenistic epigram, focusing in particular on the opening and closing poems of collections. Cf. A. Keith (2011) "Latin elegiac collections and Hellenistic epigram books" in A. Keith (ed.) *Latin Elegy and Hellenistic Epigram: A Tale of Two Genres at Rome*. Cambridge: 99-116.

³⁸⁶ I briefly alluded to this link above in my discussion of Asclepiades' priamel poem.

qui sic vel medio finitus vixit in aevo,
longior huic facta est, quam data vita fuit.

Liber, sweetest care of your friends, Liber, worthy of living amidst everlasting roses, if you have any sense, let your hair always glisten with Assyrian ointments, and let floral garlands gird your head; let shining crystalware grow dark with old Falernian, and let the supple bed burn hot with tantalizing love. Whoever has lived in such a way, even should he die at middle age, has lived a life made longer than had been given to him.

The floral imagery toward the beginning of this poem is striking, and befits a charioteer whose ultimate goal is to wear the crown of victory: the *aeterna rosa* (2) is joined by *amomum* (3), an aromatic ointment made from a shrub of the same name, and the narrator prays for *floreaserta* (4) to adorn Liber's head.³⁸⁷ But the name of Martial's addressee, Liber, prompts further metapoetic thought, in no small part due to the poet's propensity to address directly his own book of poetry throughout the *Epigrams*, often using the same vocative (*liber*) we find here.³⁸⁸ If we interpret Martial's mention of *rosae*, *amomum*, and *serta* here as potential references to the assortment of flowers Meleager wove into his own *στεφάνος*,³⁸⁹ we encounter a remarkably flattering depiction of the anthologist's task: a book worthy of garlands of flowers, perhaps one that, like Meleager's *Garland*, includes sympotic (*candida nigrescant vetulo crystallae Falerno*) and erotic (*caleat blando mollis amore torus*) themes, will live a long life, no matter when its end may come.

A similarly positive view appears just a few poems later, although Martial's addressee is much loftier, shifting from Liber (whether charioteer or book) to Domitian.

³⁸⁷ On *amomum*, equivalent to the Greek ἄμωμον (a noun, not the adjective meaning 'blameless'), cf. *LSJ* s.v. *amomum*. The reference to *Assyrium amomum* likely originates in Vergil's *Eclogues* (4.25). For additional commentary on the garland imagery, see Schöffel (2002) ad loc.

³⁸⁸ Such poems are fairly frequent from an early stage of Martial's career. Cf. 1.3, 70; 3.2, 4, 5; 4.86, 89; 7.26, 84, 97; 8.1, 72; 9.99; 12.2, 5. Admittedly in this poem, the name *Liber* is not the same word as *liber*, meaning 'book.' Even so, I would argue that the more or less homophonic relationship between these two words does not exclude the possibility of double meaning, especially given Martial's habit of addressing his book in a similar way.

³⁸⁹ Sappho is equated with the ῥόδον in Meleager's preface (*AP* 4.1.6); the ἄμωμον seems to be absent, although a λειμών ἁμωμήτιοι σελίνου ('a meadow of perfect parsley') (4.1.31) appears in reference to the otherwise unknown Parthenis.

This epigram occupies the significant position as the conclusion of Book 8 (*Ep.* 8.82):³⁹⁰

dante tibi turba querulos, Auguste, libellos,
 nos quoque quod domino carmina parva damus,
 posse deum rebus pariter Musisque vacare
 scimus, et haec etiam sarta placere tibi.
 fer vates, Auguste, tuos: nos gloria dulcis,
 nos tua cura prior deliciaeque sumus.
 non quercus te sola decet nec laurea Phoebi:
 fiat et ex hedera civica nostra tibi.

While the masses give you querulous petitions, Augustus, we too give little poems to our master. After all, we know that our god has equal time for business and the Muses, and that even these garlands please you. Put up with your poets, Augustus: we are your sweet glory, we your longstanding care and delight. The oak and Phoebus' laurel do not alone befit you – let our civic crown of ivy be made for you as well.

In this poem Martial develops the *sarta* theme that we saw in *Ep.* 8.77 – no longer does he pray that his addressee be crowned with garlands, but rather he asks that his own poetic garlands be included among the many others with which his addressee has already been crowned. Here Martial draws a more explicit connection between *carmina* and *sarta* than in the previous epigram, and in many ways this poem justifies the importance of poetic στέφανοι in a world dominated by Roman emperors. Domitian, according to Martial, is the constant recipient of garlands, whether triumphal (*laurea*) or civic (*quercus*).³⁹¹ Martial argues that his own poetic garlands (and ostensibly those of other *vates*) are no less valuable; they are not the unwelcome demands of the unwashed masses (*dante... turba querulos... libellos* 1), but works which bestow both glory (*gloria* 5) and pleasure (*deliciae* 6) upon their recipient. If, then, we take this poem and the previous one as a pair, we find that Martial has aligned books of poetry with garlands (*sarta*) of woven plants (*rosa*, *amomum*, *hedera*), and asserted that such collections are not only long-enduring, but extremely relevant (in spite, perhaps, of their Greek origins) for the

³⁹⁰ The closural *sarta* imagery of this poem is paralleled by the *coronae roseae* of 13.127, which concludes the *Xenia*, and is discussed above in the context of Asclepiades' priamel.

³⁹¹ For a thorough discussion of the crowns in this poem, cf. Schöffel (2002) ad loc.

world of the Roman empire.

A final poem from the *Epigrams* will provide a suitable closure to this chapter, as it comments on how to end a book of epigrams. Interestingly, however, this poem appears at the very beginning of Book 10 (*Ep.* 10.1):

si nimius videor seraque coronide longus
esse liber, legito pauca: libellus ero.
terque quaterque mihi finitur carmine parvo
pagina: fac tibi me quam cupis ipse brevem.

If I seem like a tome that's excessive and long, with an overly-delayed colophon, just read a few parts: then I'll be a little book. Time and time again my pages end with a brief poem: make me as short as you want.

Such an invitation to the reader to skip poems in order to make the book's excessive length more palatable is a common comic weapon in Martial's arsenal.³⁹² The difference here is his use in the first line of the word *coronide* (from *coronis*, meaning 'colophon'), which appears only here prior to the works of late antiquity.³⁹³ The similarity between the words *coronis* and *corona* should attune us to possible Meleagrian influence, and indeed we need look no further than the actual colophon to the *Garland*, as described in what is almost certainly the last epigram from the collection (*AP* 12.257):

Ἄ πύματον καμπτήρα καταγγέλλουσα κορωνίς,
έρκουρος γραπταῖς πιστοτάτα σελίσιν,
φαμί τὸν ἐκ πάντων ἡθροισμένον εἰς ἓνα μόχθον
ὑμνοθετᾶν βύβλω τᾷδ' ἐνελιζάμενον
ἐκτελέσαι Μελέαγρον, ἀείμνηστον δὲ Διοκλεῖ
ἄνθεσι συμπλέξαι μουσοπόλον στέφανον.
οὔλα δ' ἐγὼ καμφοῖσα δρακοντείοις ἴσα νώτοις,
σύνθρονος ἴδρυμαι τέρμασιν εὐμαθίας.

I, the colophon who proclaims the last lap, trustworthy custodian of written pages, declare that he who has accomplished the task of collecting in this book the work of all poets rolled into a single labor is Meleager, and that in honor of Diocles he wove from flowers this poetic garland, ever to be remembered. And I, twisted and coiled like the back of a snake, sit here enthroned alongside the conclusion of his learned

³⁹² E.g. at 11.106; 13.3; 14.2.

³⁹³ The proper noun *Coronis*, usually referring to the mythical mother of Asclepius, is not included in this count. *TLL* s.v. *coronis* cites only three occurrences for the word in the sense of colophon: here, in the scholia to Suet. gramm. 7, and Auson. 215. Strikingly, the only attestations for the word in Greek (κορωνίς) prior to Martial are in the Greek Anthology: Philodemus in *AP* 11.41 invokes the Muses to write the κορωνίς for his 37-year poetic career (and obsession with his beloved Xanthippe). *AP* 12.257, by Meleager, I am about to discuss.

work.³⁹⁴

The words κορωνίς and *coronide* in the first lines of each poem encourage us to think about how these two epigrams might relate to one another, whether or not there was any intentional allusion on Martial's part. Particularly notable are the different ways in which both authors portray their work and its culmination: for Meleager, the βύβλος is a product of great toil (μόχθον 3), a garland in service of the Muses (μουσοπόλον 6), to be remembered for all time (ἀείμνηστον 5); the value of Martial's *liber*, on the other hand, is ultimately determined by his reader, who may well find the poet's *labor* to be overdone and exhausting (*nimius* and *longus* 1), a criticism which, as we have seen, Martial himself levels at authors of poetry in the epic style. And while Meleager's colophon is the valiant rear guard (ἐρκοῦρος 2) for his book, occupying a positively regal position (σύνθρονος 8) as it entwines itself around the final lines, for Martial's impatient reader the colophon is simply an indication that the book is finally over, and usually too late at that (*sera* 1). It is possible, then, to read Martial's poem as a subtle dig at Meleager's approach to anthologizing. According to Martial, if the last epigram of the *Garland* is any indication, Meleager takes his job far too seriously, and fails to anticipate the whims of his readers – the book may be meticulously developed and the colophon noble, but none of that matters if the reader doesn't make it to the end.

It should be clear by now that Martial has an affinity with Meleager both as a poet and as a collector of poems. This affinity is by no means idolizing – Martial's many thematic allusions to Meleager more often than not comically undermine his predecessor, whether through outright contradiction or more subtle forms of banalization or

³⁹⁴ This translation is an adaptation of Paton (1918).411-3.

sexualization. Despite Martial's irreverence, though, there seems to be no malice, and indeed the very act of alluding to Meleager reflects a respect for the influence he so obviously had on the genre of epigram. This respect comes into sharper focus when we consider the connections that Martial makes between books, poems, and garlands in Book 8 – poetic garlands, he suggests, are invaluable, even in a world where epigram essentially belongs to the emperor. Martial has willingly taken up Meleager's legacy, and created a collection of poems by the only contemporary Latin epigrammatist he wishes to display: himself.

V. Conclusion

In this chapter I have traced Martial's engagement with Hellenistic erotic epigram chronologically through Meleager's *Garland*, beginning with the subgenre's founder Asclepiades, continuing with its innovators Posidippus and Callimachus, and ending with Meleager himself. Each of these authors has offered a unique contribution to our understanding of how Martial incorporates Greek epigram into his work. The deeply emotional tenor of Asclepiades' programmatic poems was distorted by Martial in a variety of subversive and irreverent ways, and he even takes the occasional shot at his groundbreaking predecessor whenever he appears intertextually in later Greek poets. The sympotic context for several of Posidippus' love poems enabled Martial to play with the relationship between wine and *eros* (or sex, as the case may be). Callimachus' consistent advocacy of erotic exclusivity proved a surprisingly frequent object of mockery by Martial, who time and again demonstrates how being overly selective in one's love

interests rarely ends well. And Meleager's allusive style encouraged Martial in turn to allude to Meleager, both thematically (where Meleager usually suffers in the comparison) and in his role as anthologist (where Martial is rather more forgiving).

This diverse assortment of observations should not, however, dissuade us from drawing some general conclusions. Almost without fail, when Martial places himself in a rivalry with one of the Hellenistic epigrammatists, the effect is comic, and as such we should be wary of taking Martial's apparent aggression or criticism toward his predecessors too seriously. Indeed, as I mentioned at the end of my last section, simply by virtue of alluding to these authors, Martial is implicitly acknowledging his debt to them, as figures looming large in his chosen genre. That said, Martial transforms and adapts the Hellenistic love poets in a myriad of ways, and while he concedes their importance to the development of his genre, he seems also to claim that love epigram as the Greeks wrote it was no longer very relevant to the Rome he depicts throughout his poetry. Whether or not Martial actually believed this is beside the point; his subversive allusions to the Greek poets are rather part of the learned game he plays with his audience, and he invites them to draw some amusing conclusions: certainly poetic 'garlands' were still valuable insofar as they brought honor and delight to the emperor, but poems on the pleasures of Cypris, the torments of unsatisfied erotic love, and the true nature of beauty just did not fit into Martial's Roman world, full of nagging wives, one-eyed prostitutes, and incessant – and only sometimes appropriate – sexual cravings.

My next chapter will explore the other side of the coin, namely Martial's interaction with the imperial Greek poets Lucilius and Nicarchus, who, living in Rome, were more than happy to write about the sordid topics which their Hellenistic forebears so

completely avoided. Needless to say, Martial relates quite differently, and much more closely, with these skoptic epigrammatists, but even so, many of the same phenomena we have already encountered will recur in new and surprising ways.

CHAPTER FOUR: MAKING MOCKERY MINE: MARTIAL AND SKOPTIC EPIGRAM

After a selection of sixty-four (so-called) sympotic epigrams in Book 11 of the Greek Anthology, Constantine Cephalas, whose tenth-century edition of the collection reflects the form we have today, inserts a concise description of the poems to follow:³⁹⁵

πολλή κατὰ τὸν βίον τῶν σκωπτικῶν ἐπιγραμμάτων ἢ χρῆσις· φιλεῖ γάρ πως ἄνθρωπος
ἢ αὐτὸς εἷς τινὰς παίζειν ἢ πρὸς τοὺς πλησίον ἀποσκώπτοντος ἀκούειν, διὰ τῶν ἐξῆς τοῖς
παλαιοῖς γινόμενον ἐπιδείξομεν.

Skoptic epigrams are quite useful for everyday life – after all, people have a certain tendency either to mock others or to give an audience to those who do the mocking. This was true of the ancients, as I will demonstrate with the following poems.

As a definition of skoptic epigram, Cephalas' comments are not particularly insightful, but they nevertheless offer a rare window through which to understand how these types of epigrams were perceived in the ancient world. Cephalas calls attention to two primary attributes of skoptic epigrams: they mock individuals (εἷς τινὰς παίζειν; πρὸς τοὺς πλησίον ἀποσκώπτοντος) and they have some sort of practical utility (κατὰ τὸν βίον... χρῆσις). The subsequent poems in Book 11, nearly four hundred in number, bear out the former quality, as the vast majority consist of direct attacks on a specific person. The latter quality is more difficult to prove. What χρῆσις does Cephalas envision the ancients to have derived from these epigrams? The poems may have been a valuable source of social commentary, or perhaps they presented to their audiences patterns for how not to live – sadly, Cephalas fails to elaborate and so we are left to speculate.

Modern scholarship takes a more cautious approach. Gideon Nisbet acknowledges that any attempt to categorize an epigram, especially one from the Hellenistic period, as

³⁹⁵ Cod. Pal. Graec. 23 p. 517. On Cephalas' classification of the earlier poems as sympotic (they take τὸ συμποτικὸν εἶδος), see p. 507 of the same ms.

‘skoptic’ is contingent upon a preexisting interpretive framework: Book 11 of the Greek Anthology groups epigrams of roughly similar type under the heading ΣΚΩΠΤΙΚΑ, which leads us to measure earlier poems against a much later and potentially arbitrary standard.³⁹⁶ Rather than wrestle with these quandaries of classification, Nisbet establishes temporal boundaries in his monograph on skoptic epigram, restricting his focus to the imperial Greek epigrammatists who survive in *AP* 11. He identifies a few threads common to these poets, who (he argues) are strongly influenced by Old Comedy.³⁹⁷

The Greek skoptic epigrammatists repeatedly steal from Aristophanes, not only at the level of the individual gag but also in building a repertoire of moves which incorporates a range of anti-realist strategies: paradox, hyperbole, parody, and a collection of absurdist procedures that are often tagged ‘metafiction’.

Nisbet also explores the potential connection between these kinds of epigrams (“short, funny poems”) and the symposium, by way of illustrating the importance of cultural context in understanding the constant evolution of skoptic humor.³⁹⁸ In this chapter, I will follow Nisbet in limiting my definition of skoptic Greek epigram to the works of a small group of Greek poets writing under the Roman empire and gathered (however arbitrarily) in *AP* 11. In the interest of space, I will further confine the scope of my investigation to the two imperial Greek poets most likely to predate Martial: Lucillius, who writes almost certainly in the Neronian period, and Nicarchus, who writes shortly thereafter.

What we know about Lucillius and Nicarchus relies almost exclusively on their presence within the Greek Anthology, and so it is impossible to provide much accurate

³⁹⁶ Nisbet (2003b) 357-8.

³⁹⁷ Nisbet (2003a) xiv-xv.

³⁹⁸ Nisbet (2003a) xv-xvii.

biographical information for either poet. In Lucillius' case, it has long been agreed that he wrote under Nero, on the basis of *AP* 9.572, the last line of which references the emperor by name.³⁹⁹ There are about 120 epigrams in the Greek Anthology attributed to him, and many of the 52 attributed to pseudo-Lucian are likely of Lucillian authorship as well – Rozema suggests that 142 poems in total can be more or less securely identified as written by Lucillius.⁴⁰⁰ He probably collected his epigrams into books, at least two in number. (This is again based on *AP* 9.572, which claims to be the proem to Book 2.) Thematically, the great majority of these poems are aggressive mockeries of what Nisbet describes as a “constructed ‘Other’” consisting of socially distinct and often disdained groups, such as women, paupers, highly specialized laborers, the deformed, and pervers (all of which we will encounter over the course of this chapter).⁴⁰¹ Stylistically, Lucillius' epigrams use straightforward, simple language in a carefully balanced structure, leading up to a succinct and biting punchline, typically the final verse or couplet.⁴⁰² Simplicity of style does not, of course, imply that the poems are simplistic: the sharpness of Lucillius' wit is apparent, and clever wordplay and generic parody are common.

If Lucillius' background is murky, that of Nicarchus is pitch-black. Evidence of imitation makes it relatively certain that Nicarchus did succeed Lucillius, although whether he was a Neronian or later author is unknown. Some scholars have posited an Egyptian origin based on isolated references to Egyptian gods (“Bubastis,” *AP* 11.18.5) and places (“Paraetionium,” 11.124.4), but there is little solid evidence beyond these two

³⁹⁹ Brief summaries of Lucillius' life and works are readily available: cf. *NP*, M.G. Albani s.v. “Lucillius”; *OCD*, A.D.E. Cameron, s.v. “Lucillius.” A more thorough review (to the extent that such is possible) is provided by Rozema (1971: 1-71). Rozema's overview also includes a valuable section on the history of Lucillian scholarship.

⁴⁰⁰ Rozema (1971) 1.

⁴⁰¹ Nisbet (2003a) 36.

⁴⁰² Cf. esp. Burnikel (1980) 8-15.

words.⁴⁰³ We do know that approximately forty Nicarchan poems have been transmitted in the Greek Anthology, and another five, evidently from an epigram book, are preserved on the Oxyrhynchus papyri.⁴⁰⁴ His themes are comparable to those favored by Lucillius, but this similarity does not, however, as some have argued, reduce Nicarchus to the status of a second-rate Lucillian imitator – though he did frequently borrow subjects and language from Lucillius, he adapted this material in innovative ways.⁴⁰⁵ Most notable is Nicarchus' unabashed fondness for incorporating sexuality and obscenity into his epigrams, far more than Lucillius.⁴⁰⁶

Martial's interaction with Lucillius and Nicarchus is a complex phenomenon, as this chapter will demonstrate, but a brief remark on general stylistic and structural borrowings is worth making at the outset. Lucillius, as he developed the *skoptik* into a distinct subgenre of epigram, cultivated a succinct and mordant style of writing which resulted either in very short poems, often consisting of just a couplet, or, as I mentioned above, in the concentration of an epigram's humor into a powerful concluding punchline. Nicarchus, in turn, imitated this habit while placing an emphasis on earthy themes and obscene vocabulary. Martial ultimately adopted both of these techniques – the concise punchline and linguistic obscenity – as his own; indeed, it is striking that two of the stylistic traits for which he is best known owe a great deal to his unsung Greek predecessors.⁴⁰⁷

⁴⁰³ Cf. Gow and Page (1968); *NP*, M.G. Albani s.v. "Nicarchus."

⁴⁰⁴ P. Oxy. LXVI 4501-2.

⁴⁰⁵ Nisbet (2003a: 82) is especially opposed to classifying Nicarchus as a "bargain-basement Loukillios." He suggests that while Nicarchus may have been a Lucillian imitator, he survives because he was "the smartest and most successful."

⁴⁰⁶ This predilection for the obscene is especially clear from the Oxyrhynchus poems, which seem to have been less curated than those in the Greek Anthology.

⁴⁰⁷ For similarly broad comparisons of Martial and Lucillius/Nicarchus, cf. Burnikel (1980) 8-15; Sullivan (1990) 85-

I. Martial and the Themes of Skoptic Epigram

Beyond structural and stylistic borrowings, Martial clearly plays upon skoptic themes (or rather, targets) popularized by Lucillius and appropriated by Lucillian successors from Nicarchus onward. In this section I will look systematically at several categories of themes prominent in imperial Greek epigram for which there is clear evidence of Martial's adaptation: mockery of professions, mockery of physical defects, and mockery of lifestyle. As we will see, in some cases Martial uses these themes only on the most general level – both he and Lucillius, for example, make fun of the poor, but the similarities stop there. In other cases, however, there is solid evidence that Martial is imitating specific Lucillian or Nicarchan epigrams. Some of these have been long recognized, most notably Martial's near-translation (*Ep.* 6.19) of Lucillius' *AP* 11.141, on an excessively bombastic lawyer, which I will discuss in detail below. But most of Martial's imitations of skoptic epigram are less blatant, and an important goal of this chapter is to argue (sometimes boldly) for an array of heretofore unnoticed intertexts.

First, however, it will be informative to consider briefly which common skoptic themes Martial does *not* incorporate into his body of work. These are in fact relatively few and far between, at least according to the evidence provided by the Greek Anthology. There are three categories of people whom Martial never mocks, despite strong imperial Greek – most frequently Lucillian – precedent: poor athletes (especially boxers),

91; Fitzgerald (2007) 27-8; Livingstone and Nisbet (2010) 105-9. For an excellent summary of these two components of Martial's style, cf. *OCD*, M. Citroni, s.v. "Martial": "His realistic epigrams, while maintaining a high literary quality, open themselves to a lower and cruder language, including obscenity: in this area Martial is one of the boldest Latin poets, and, in general, many everyday objects and acts, and the words that describe them, enter Latin poetry for the first time with Martial. His most celebrated virtue is the technique with which he realizes his comic effects, either giving his epigrams a novel or surprising conclusion which throws an unexpected light on the situation being described, or else concentrating the entire sense of the poem at the end, in a pointed, antithetical, or paradoxical formulation of extraordinary density and richness of expression."

charlatan astrologers, and cowardly soldiers. With respect to athletes and astrologers, Martial has little to say – the only references in the *Epigrams* to either profession serve as simple narrative exposition for poems with unrelated main points.⁴⁰⁸ Soldiers, on the other hand, make frequent appearances in the *Epigrams*, but Martial always portrays them in a positive light, a striking mark of consistency in a generally inconsistent poet. Nearly a dozen poems explicitly praise the virtues of Roman soldiers past and present, and apparently without the insincerity we might otherwise read into Martialian panegyric.⁴⁰⁹ What accounts for Martial's decision to glorify brave soldiers instead of mocking cowardly ones? Flavian military activity, especially Domitian's ongoing battles with and ultimate victories against the Dacians and Sarmatians during the last half of the 80's, probably played a role:⁴¹⁰ by depicting and glorifying military heroism, Martial was bolstering the Roman reputation for bravery in battle and thus positioning himself in the good graces of the emperor, whereas poking fun at military cowardice ran the risk of being interpreted as actual criticism of the Roman army. More surprising, perhaps, is Martial's decision not to take up the familiar skoptic derision of unsound ships and the dangers of sailing.⁴¹¹ The perils of the sea are a common theme in both Greek and Latin poetry from epic to elegy, and it is striking that Martial did not adapt the comic approach of his contemporary Greek models.⁴¹² This absence is difficult to explain, but one factor

⁴⁰⁸ E.g. athletes: *Ep.* 2.14, 5.12, 7.32; astrologers: 2.7, 9.82. There is a small exception regarding boxers, on which see below.

⁴⁰⁹ Cf. 1.31, 1.93, 6.25, 6.58, 6.76, 9.31, 9.45, 10.26.

⁴¹⁰ Martial practically deifies Domitian for these victories: cf. esp. 6.10, 7.6, 8.64.

⁴¹¹ Lucilius has three poems on the topic (*AP* 11.245-7); Nicarchus has two (11.331-2). See also 11.248, by Bianor. The usual joke is that the ship in question has taken on such a fantastic amount of water that the ocean (along with fish, other ships, Poseidon, etc.) is now being transported by the ship, as opposed to the other way around.

⁴¹² Martial makes mention of sailors on occasion (e.g. *Ep.* 12.57.12: *naufragus loquax*). The closest thing to a poem actually about sailing is 9.40, on a certain Diodorus, who survives a shipwreck lest his beloved be unable to fulfill the vow she made for his safe return: to perform fellatio on him.

that might account for this would be the reduction of shipwrecks to literary clichés by the Flavian period, if not much earlier.⁴¹³ The prominence of such scenes in epic in particular may have discouraged Martial from including them in his own poetry, which, as we have seen, he claims is grounded in reality.⁴¹⁴ Such arguments from silence should only be taken so far, however, and accordingly I will now turn to the multitude of occasions on which Martial *does* borrow skoptic themes.

II. Martial and the Mockery of Professions

The majority of Greek skoptic poems, perhaps surprisingly to a modern audience, mock unskilled or inept practitioners of specific professions. Bad poets and singers are frequent targets for both Lucillius and Martial, although they approach their invective in different ways. Lucillius tends to characterize bad singing as a dealer of death: a man's dirge for his dead son is so terrible that it makes the narrator even more dead than the son (AP 11.135.1-2: ἐμὲ... τὸν πολὺ τοῦ παρὰ σοὶ νεκρότερον τεκνίου); Callistratus slaughters the narrator with a war's worth of bad hexameters (11.136.4: φονικῶν ἑξαμέτρων πόλεμον); even the dead have cause to fear the recently deceased singer Eutychides (11.133.5: νῦν ὑμῖν ὁ Χάρων ἐπελήλυθε, "now you're really in hell"). Martial, meanwhile, is primarily concerned with two specific kinds of bad poets: those who force him to listen to them (e.g. *Ep.* 3.44 and 45) and those who plagiarize, either by passing his work off as their own (e.g. 1.52, 12.63) or by reciting their own (bad) poems

⁴¹³ On which see B. Dunsch (2013) "'Describe nunc tempestatem': Sea storm and shipwreck type scenes in ancient literature" in C. Thompson (ed.) *Shipwreck in Art and Literature: Images and Interpretations from Antiquity to the Present Day*. New York: 42-59.

⁴¹⁴ This of course cannot fully explain why Martial chose not to parody the recurring *topos* in the same way that the Greek epigrammatists did.

as if they were his (e.g. 10.3).⁴¹⁵ Martial's shift in focus from the Lucillian model might be attributed to a different lived experience, especially in regard to plagiarism; as a well-known poet distributing Latin poems at Rome, Martial was likely more susceptible to unscrupulous imitation than the Greek Lucillius.⁴¹⁶

Even so, one Lucillian epigram on a poor performer, this time a dancer, does seem to have made an impact on Martial at the earliest stage of his career. Lucillius describes a performance during which the dancer's lack of skill well suited his roles, except in one key respect (*AP* 254):

Πάντα καθ' ἱστορίην ὀρχούμενος, ἐν τὸ μέγιστον
τῶν ἔργων παριδὼν ἠνίασας μέγਾਲως.
τὴν μὲν γὰρ Νιόβην ὀρχούμενος ὡς λίθος ἔστης,
καὶ πάλιν ὦν Καπανεὺς ἐξαπίνης ἔπεσες·
ἀλλ' ἐπὶ τῆς Κανάκης ἀφυῶς, ὅτι καὶ ξίφος ἦν σοι
καὶ ζῶν ἐξῆλθες· τοῦτο παρ' ἱστορίην.

All of your dancing went along with the story, but you overlooked the most important part, which was a huge disappointment. To be sure, when you played Niobe, you stood there like a stone, and likewise when you were Capaneus you suddenly fell over.⁴¹⁷ But you made a terrible Canace: even though you had a sword, you left the stage alive.⁴¹⁸ *That* went against the story.

Martial's take on this poem also comes in a performative context, but one in which the actor, portraying Orpheus in a 'theatrical execution,' is an unwilling participant (*Spec.* 24 [21]):

quidquid in Orpheo Rhodope spectasse theatro
dicitur, exhibuit, Caesar, harena tibi.
repserunt scopuli mirandaque silva cucurrit,
quale fuisse nemus creditur Hesperidum.
adfuit inmixtum pecori genus omne ferarum
et supra vatem multa pependit avis,
ipse sed ingrato iacuit laceratus ab urso.

⁴¹⁵ There are only a few exceptions to this general focus: in 4.41, the narrator suggests that the scarf around a certain reciter's neck would be better served around his audience's ears; in 11.93, the narrator laments that the poet Theodorus did not burn down along with his house.

⁴¹⁶ For a recent take on Martial and plagiarism, see McGill (2012) 74-111.

⁴¹⁷ One of the seven against Thebes, Capaneus was struck by lightning as he attempted to mount the walls of the city and fell to his death. Cf. Euripides *Phoen.* 1173ff.

⁴¹⁸ Canace, daughter of Aeolus, had an incestuous relationship with her brother – upon learning this, Aeolus sent her a sword with which she committed suicide. The story was told in Euripides' fragmentary *Aeolus*.

haec tantum res est facta παρ' ἱστορίαν.

Whatever Rhodope watched on Orpheus' stage (so they say), the arena shows to you, Caesar. The rocks crawled and the woods (unbelievable!) ran, a grove just like the Hesperides' is thought to have been. Every kind of wild beast was there, mingling with the herds, and many a bird fluttered above the bard. But he himself laid there, mangled by an ungrateful bear. That was the only thing done against the story.

As I discussed in my first chapter, the appearance of the Greek language in the *Epigrams* designedly causes the reader to sit up and take notice, and here Martial ends his epigram with the same Greek phrase (παρ' ἱστορίαν) in the same metrical position as does Lucilius. I would argue that this is as close to an explicit acknowledgement of Martial's debt to imperial Greek epigram as we will find in his body of work.⁴¹⁹ The other parallels between the poems have long been recognized. Weinreich was the first to acknowledge their common theatrical (or amphitheatrical) context,⁴²⁰ and later scholars devoted particular attention to their structural relationship: both poems begin with a generalization which is supported by an accumulation of evidence, only to be refuted at the end.⁴²¹ The primary formal difference, of course, is Martial's omission of καθ' ἱστορίαν as a contrast to the concluding παρ' ἱστορίαν, which seems to reflect each poet's distinct approach to the humor of his poem: Lucilius' joke, a continuous lampoon of the bad dancer, begins at the first line with καθ' ἱστορίαν and proceeds all the way to the end, whereas Martial's humor results only from the unexpectedness of the mauled Orpheus (and the corresponding Greek expression).⁴²²

⁴¹⁹ This reading assumes that Housman's emendation of the transmitted *ita pictoria* is correct. The paleographic case is sound, positing a scribal miscopying of the Greek [I]APICTOPIA as the Latin ITAPICTORIA. Cf. Coleman (2006) 180-1 for fuller discussion.

⁴²⁰ Weinreich (1928) 40-8.

⁴²¹ The earliest recognition of the parallel was made by Prinz (1910). Siedschlag (1977: 58) describes the formal technique used in both epigrams as the 'rule-exception formula' (*Regel-Ausnahme-Schema*). Cf. also Burnikel (1980) 12 and Coleman (2006) 175.

⁴²² Burnikel (1980: 13) argues that this difference is a technical one: Lucilius' καθ' ἱστορίαν is necessary to establish the ironic tone of the whole poem – whether the dancer follows or departs from the story, he is still a bad dancer. But for Martial, καθ' ἱστορίαν would be superfluous, as the important point is not the actual accuracy of the scene in the theater, but rather the faux-Orpheus' stark departure from the myth (παρ' ἱστορίαν), which serves as the poem's

It is important to take these comparisons into account, but we should also recall the likelihood that Martial's epigram was written with its Lucillian analog in mind, and that his adaptations of that model can tell us something about how he interacts with near-contemporary Greek epigrammatists.⁴²³ Consider how each poet relates his character to the world of myth: Lucillius' dancer is consistently terrible at his job, which fortuitously results in his faithful adherence to mythic tradition, except (to the narrator's chagrin) in that he fails to use Canace's sword on himself. Martial's performer is also terrible at his job, but he is no professional, and the job has been imposed upon him from without; 'Orpheus', deposited unwillingly into an otherwise faithful mythic setting, is the sole source of inaccuracy, and the fatal result that Lucillius' dancer so deserves (at least according to Lucillius) actually comes to pass for Martial's performer. A striking difference here, thrown into sharp relief by the acerbic tone of Lucillius' poem, is Martial's apparent sympathy for his hapless subject: the murdering bear is *ingratus* (7), unappreciative of the faux-Orpheus, who may not have deserved death.⁴²⁴ Although it is possible to conclude from this that Martial is quietly subverting the custom of *damnatio ad bestias* with his pathetic depiction of the slaughtered Orpheus, to base such an argument on a single word is precarious to say the least. Alternatively, we might take *ingratus* as ironic, which would imply that 'Orpheus' (presumably a criminal and not a very good singer) got exactly what he deserved.⁴²⁵ Either of these interpretations benefits

punchline.

⁴²³ Not all scholars fully subscribe to Weinreich's description of *Spec.24* as "ein Musterbeispiel für schöpferische *imitatio*" ("an example of creative *imitatio*"). Burnikel in particular advocates caution, suggesting that Martial found *AP* 254 more useful as a structural model than as a thematic one (12-13). Burnikel's point is well taken, but given that my project argues for a deeper and more complex relationship between Martial and Greek epigram than has been previously acknowledged, the connections between these two poems deserve a closer look.

⁴²⁴ Burnikel (1980: 13-4) points out the sympathetic tone of *ingrato urso*.

⁴²⁵ Coleman (1990: 62-3) opts for this ironic interpretation.

from comparison with *AP* 254 – whether or not Martial is genuinely sympathetic toward his performer, Lucillius’ obvious antipathy offers a convenient foil against which Martial can and does play.

Lucillius and Martial both satirize a different kind of performer as well: the case-pleader. The following pair of poems on lawyers is the most celebrated example of Martial’s borrowing from Lucillius.⁴²⁶

AP 11.141:

Χοιρίδιον καὶ βοῦν ἀπολώλεκα καὶ μίαν αἴγα,
 ὧν χάριν εἴληφας μισθάριον, Μενέκλεις·
 οὔτε δέ μοι κοινόν τι πρὸς Ὀθρυάδαν γεγένηται,
 οὔτ’ ἀπάγω κλέπτας τοὺς ἀπὸ Θερμοπυλῶν·
 ἀλλὰ πρὸς Εὐτυχίδην ἔχομεν κρίσιν· ὥστε τί ποιεῖ
 ἐνθάδε μοι Ξέρξης καὶ Λακεδαιμόνιοι;
 πλὴν κάμοῦ μνήσθητι νόμου χάριν, ἢ μέγα κράζω·
 “Ἄλλα λέγει Μενεκλῆς, ἄλλα τὸ χοιρίδιον.”

My piglet, my cow, and one goat were all stolen, so I hired you, lawyer Menecles. But why are you ranting about Leonidas? The famous Three Hundred aren’t piglet-thieves! I’m suing Eutychides – what do Xerxes and the Spartans have to do with anything? At least mention me (it’s custom!) or else I’ll shout, “I should’ve hired the piglet instead.”

Ep. 6.19:

non de vi neque caede nec veneno,
 sed lis est mihi de tribus capellis:
 vicini queror has abesse furto.
 hoc iudex sibi postulat probari:
 tu Carrhas Mithridaticumque bellum
 et periuria Punici furoris
 et Sullas Mariosque Muciosque
 magna voce sonas manuque tota.
 iam dic, Postume, de tribus capellis.

I have a lawsuit, not about assault or murder or poison, but about three goats: they’ve gone missing, and my complaint is that a neighbor has stolen them. The judge demands proof. You thunder on, in a loud voice and with every gesture available, about Carrhae and the Mithridatic War and the lies of the crazed Parthians and Sullas and Mariuses and Muciuses. Please, Postumus, talk about my three goats.

It would be difficult to deny that Martial’s epigram is based on Lucillius’, but by no means is it a slavish imitation. Of course, both poems have the same premise: a beleaguered plaintiff has had three farm animals stolen, and his lawyer booms on about

⁴²⁶ Burnikel (1980), Sullivan (1991: 86-7), and Holzberg (2002) all juxtapose these two epigrams.

irrelevant historical matters, much to his client's chagrin. Likewise, there is a rough formal parallel between Lucillius' use of χοιρίδιον as the first and last word of the poem, and Martial's repetition of *de tribus capellis* at the end of the second and final lines. The differences, however, are more telling than the similarities:

First, there is the matter of the livestock. The Lucillian narrator has lost a pig, a cow, and one goat (μία ἄϊγα 1). Martial's narrator has lost *three* goats, an interesting multiplication of the only animal for which Lucillius specifies a number (μία). Perhaps this reflects a subtle claim to superiority on Martial's part, something like a comically debased version of the epic 'ten tongues vs. a hundred tongues' dispute.

The lawyers' historical citations offer another example of Martial as Lucillius in triplicate: the Lucillian narrator mentions two, while Martial's narrator provides six. The citations themselves are also quite distinct, apart from the obvious Greek and Latin dichotomy. Menecles provides two examples of Spartan heroism, sole survivor Othryades at the Battle of Thyrea and the famed Three Hundred against Xerxes at Thermopylae (3-4). Martial, meanwhile, begins his list with the Battle of Carrhae, a shoddy Roman equivalent to Thermopylae, thoroughly lacking in heroism and with 30,000 Roman casualties instead of 300 Greek ones. He then expands his scope chronologically and geographically, traveling backward in time through the Mithridatic and Punic Wars, returning to Rome (perhaps) with Marius and Sulla, and ending with Mucius Scaevola at the birth of the republic (5-7). This sweeping range strikes me as another example of Martial amplifying Lucillius, but given that Postumus' Carrhae is such a ridiculously inept echo of Menecles' Thermopylae, Martial's tongue is firmly in his cheek.

The poems also differ in narrative technique. Lucilius' epigram is set at the moment when the narrator is on the verge of his breaking point. The perfect verbs (ἀπολώλεκα 1, εἴληφας 2, γεγένηται 3) provide a backdrop for the immediate situation, in which the plaintiff is giving his lawyer a command (μνήσθητι 7) and threatening future humiliation (κράξω 7) otherwise. Martial's poem, however, is presented as a vivid narrative of the trial: the charge is explicitly stated without adornment (*furto* 3), the judge appears demanding evidence, and the lawyer's physical comportment is described (*magna voce... manuque tota* 8) alongside the content of his speech. A sequence of present tense verbs (*lis est mihi* 2, *queror* 3, *postulat* 4, *sonas* 8) brings the reader along for the ride, culminating in the blunt imperative *dic* (9). The result is a poem that is more direct and somewhat easier to follow than the Lucillian version – perhaps Martial is reacting against the more impassioned account of Lucilius' narrator in favor of a more detached, coherent story.

Along these same lines, the Lucillian narrator is more personally engaged in the action of his poem. First person pronouns proliferate (μοι 3, μοι 6, κάμοῦ μνήσθητι 7), as do an array of first person verbs (ἀπολώλεκα 1, ἀπάγω 4, ἔχομεν 5, etc.). Money is clearly a motivating factor, given the stress on the legal fee (μισθάριον 2), which the narrator realizes is going to waste. His desperation culminates in the poem's punchline, and the ultimate sign of personal engagement: actually shouting out in the midst of the trial. Martial's narrator, on the other hand, remains more aloof; in fact, only two first person words occur (*mihi* 2, *queror* 3). The first line undercuts the importance of the case (*non de vi neque caede nec veneno*), and the defendant is not even named, reduced to an anonymous *vicinus* (3). Moreover, without the threat that concludes Lucilius' poem, the

command in Martial's last line lacks the same urgency and instead resonates a kind of dispassionate irony – even though Martial's narrator is involved in the case, he is somehow still a detached observer.

So what do these differences tell us about Martial's adaptation of Lucilius? By all appearances, Martial has taken Lucilius' exasperated plaintiff and his bombastic Greek lawyer, and transformed them into a less emotionally invested plaintiff and his even more bombastic (and therefore more inept) Roman lawyer, all the while subtly outdoing his Greek predecessor in the much-coveted categories of 'number of goats' and 'number of irrelevant historical examples.' Martial's poem is even one line longer than Lucilius', which is either a coincidence or the cherry on top of a numerical claim to superiority. To sum up, then, Martial seems to be Romanizing, depersonalizing, and elaborating (or clarifying) Lucilius, with the implicit, if not entirely serious, suggestion that the Latin poem 'wins.'

Another occasional target of Lucilius is the grammarian (ὁ γραμματικός), whom he characterizes as inept (*AP* 138, on which see below), divorced from reality (*AP* 140, 278), immoderate (*AP* 279), or even adulterous (*AP* 139). Such a broad range of negative qualities (along with the relative scarcity of evidence) makes it difficult to draw any general conclusions about how Lucilius portrays γραμματικοί, but the fact that he satirizes them at all is noteworthy. Martial's *grammaticus*, on the other hand, appears not so much as a target, but either as a practitioner of one profession among many others (as in *Ep.* 2.7 and 5.56) or as someone who has nothing to do with a book of epigrams in the first place (10.21.5-6: *mea carmina, Sexte, / grammaticis placeant ut sine grammaticis*, "let my poems, Sextus, please the grammarians, to the extent that they *have* no

grammarians”). That said, Martial does use the stereotypical focus of the grammarian’s nit-picking, the solecism, to poke fun at people outside of the profession. One of these poems, mocking the false knight Calliodorus (*Ep.* 5.38.8: σολοικισμόν, *Calliodore, facis*), I have already analyzed in my first chapter. The other poem too deserves a closer look; it offers a wry perspective on choosing one’s wife, as well as an obscene joke at the narrator’s own expense (*Ep.* 11.19):

quaeris cur nolim te ducere, Galla? diserta es.
saepe soloecismum mentula nostra facit.

You ask why I don’t want to marry you, Galla? You’re eloquent. Unfortunately, my dick has a habit of misspeaking.

This epigram unexpectedly recalls one of Lucillius’ grammarian poems, despite the differences in approach I have just discussed (*AP* 11.138):

Ἄν τοῦ γραμματικοῦ μνησθῶ μόνον Ἡλιοδώρου,
εὐθὺ σολοικίζον τὸ στόμα μου δέδεταί.

I just have to bring the grammarian Heliodorus to mind, and right away my mouth starts misspeaking.

At first glance, these epigrams seem to have only superficial similarities, namely their short length and their mention of solecism (whether literal or figurative). Further consideration, however, will yield some valuable insights on Martial’s adaptation of Lucillian skoptic. Lucillius’ poem makes a fairly straightforward joke: the grammarian is so inept that his linguistic errors are contagious, not only through close contact, but through merely thinking about the man himself.⁴²⁷ Martial’s poem ostensibly makes a different point: Galla is so ‘well-educated’ that she would never tolerate the narrator’s ‘linguistic’ errors (presumably a metaphor for some sort of sexual dysfunction). But the metaphor of the *soloecismum* here should be pressed further, especially in light of

⁴²⁷ This idea that mental images can have real-life consequences is a common source of humor for Lucillius. Cf. *AP* 11.257 (discussed below), in which a man dies after dreaming about a doctor, or *AP* 11.277, on a man so lazy that he swears off sleep after dreaming that he was running.

Lucillius' mockery of that very fault in *AP* 11.138. It is in fact possible that Martial had Lucillius' poem in mind while writing his own epigram. That both poems are only two lines long is a fair starting point, but consider in particular the precise syntactic parallels between the final verse of each couplet: εὐθὺ σολοικίζον τὸ στόμα μου δέδετα / *saepe soloecismum mentula nostra facit*. The word order in both lines is the same: adverb (εὐθὺ/*saepe*) - direct object (σολοικίζον/*soloecismum*) - subject (τὸ στόμα/*mentula*)- possessive (μου/*nostra*) - verb (δέδετα/*facit*). Note also the metrical parallels: both pentameters scan identically, and σολοικίζον/*soloecismum* (the punchline for both poems) appears in the same metrical position. The switch from στόμα to *mentula* is particularly evocative, and the word στόμα might still be active in Martial's poem in the sense of the *os impurum*, which implies that Galla may not be as eloquent as she so pretentiously lets on.

Lucillius gives practitioners of the visual arts no more quarter than those who work with words, and on one interesting occasion, Martial alludes to his Greek predecessor in a way that blurs the distinctions between these two types of profession. We will first consider Lucillius' appraisal of two paintings by a certain Menestratus (*AP* 11.214):

Γράψας Δευκαλίωνα, Μενέστρατε, καὶ Φαέθοντα
 ζητεῖς, τίς τούτων ἄξιός ἐστι τίνοϛ.
 τοῖς ἰδίοις αὐτοῦς τιμήσομεν· ἄξιος ὄντως
 ἐστὶ πυρὸς Φαέθων, Δευκαλίων δ' ὕδατος.

So you've painted Deucalion and Phaethon, Menestratus, and you ask which one is worth anything. We'll judge them on their own merits: your Phaethon is worthy of the fire, I can assure you, and your Deucalion worthy of the water.

Here, Lucillius metonymically connects Phaethon and Deucalion with the destructive power of their respective elements (Phaethon's fiery death in his father's chariot was well-known, as was Deucalion's survival of a cataclysmic flood) in order to mock the

poor quality of Menestratus' paintings: his Phaethon should be burned and his Deucalion tossed in the water.⁴²⁸ Martial adapts this imagery to a new context (*Ep.* 5.53):

Colchida quid scribis, quid scribis, amice, Thyesten?
quo tibi vel Nioben, Basse, vel Andromachen?
materia est, mihi crede, tuis aptissima chartis
Deucalion vel, si non placet hic, Phaethon.

Why do you write about the Colchian woman? Why, my friend, do you write about Thyestes? Niobe or Andromache, what are they to you, Bassus? Believe me, the most suitable topic for your pages is Deucalion or (if he doesn't suit you) Phaethon.

It seems apparent that Martial is engaging somehow with Lucillius here – certain scholars have even argued that Martial's punchline would be incomprehensible to a reader who was not familiar with the Lucillian poem, given that he does not actually explain why Deucalion or Phaethon are suitable subjects for Bassus.⁴²⁹ Burnikel makes some useful formal comparisons: in addition to pointing out that Martial does not make the fire/water juxtaposition explicit, he observes that in *AP* 214, the self-conscious target is the one who asks whether his work has any merit, whereas in *Ep.* 5.53, the narrator suggestively poses the question himself. Likewise, Martial doubles the number of subjects (Lucillius' target depicts Phaethon and Deucalion, Martial's depicts Medea, Thyestes, Niobe, and Andromache), which adds to his mockery the additional – and unflattering – dimension of excessive composition. Burnikel ultimately concludes that Martial's modifications both refine the sarcasm and increase the irony of Lucillius' poem.⁴³⁰

But a crucial difference between the two poems, and one on which Burnikel remarks

⁴²⁸ Lucillius uses the Phaethon-fire/Deucalion-water trope again in *AP* 11.131. The association between Phaethon and Deucalion as representations of opposing elements can be found as early as Ovid's *Fasti* (4.777ff., and cf. Canobbio 2011 ad loc.), which may have had some influence on Lucillius.

⁴²⁹ Cf. Burnikel (1980) 18, Howell (1995) ad loc. I am less convinced that the meaning of Martial's epigram is absolutely contingent upon knowledge of Lucillius; nevertheless, familiarity with the earlier poem certainly adds point to the joke.

⁴³⁰ Burnikel (1980) 16-8. Canobbio (2011: intr. n. ad loc.) classifies Martial's tactics as a "clever use of rhetoric" (*un sapiente uso della retorica*) such as is absent in the Lucillian epigram.

only in passing, is Martial's recontextualization of the joke: while Lucillius' target is a painter, Martial's is an author.⁴³¹ Certainly Martial's denigration of Bassus' mythological predilections aligns with his oft-stated aversion to such themes in favor of realism, and this epigram can be read in and of itself as a statement of poetics.⁴³² But why use Lucillius' poem, which is about painting, not literature, as his model? The first word of *AP* 214, γράψας, may have prompted Martial to make a connection between the arts of painting and writing (we might expect συγγράψας if Lucillius were referring to the written word, but the link is still not much of a stretch).⁴³³ Further, it seems reasonable to suggest that Martial was *knowingly* recontextualizing Lucillius' imagery, and this shift would no doubt have had a surprising effect upon a similarly knowledgeable reader.

The imperial Greek epigrammatists mocked more mundane lines of work, as well, a habit perpetuated by Martial. Barbers, for example, were prime targets, typically on account of their leisurely pace and/or unyielding brutality.⁴³⁴ Lucillius memorably treats the latter characteristic (*AP* 191):

“Ἄρες Ἄρες βροτολοιγέ, μαιφόνε,” παύεο, κουρεῦ,
τέμνων: οὐ γὰρ ἔχεις οὐκέτι ποῦ με τεμεῖς:
ἀλλ’ ἤδη μεταβάς ἐπὶ τοὺς μύας ἢ τὰ κάτωθεν
τῶν γονάτων, οὕτω τέμνε με, καὶ παρέχω.
νῦν μὲν γὰρ μυῖων ὁ τόπος γέμει: ἦν δ’ ἐπιμείνης,
ᾧ ψεῖ καὶ γυπῶν ἔθνεα καὶ κοράκων.

“O Ares, Ares, man-slaying fiend!” Please, barber, stop cutting me – there’s nowhere left to cut. At least move down to my thighs and lower legs: they still have some flesh, you can cut me there. Look, the place is

⁴³¹ Given his choice of *materia*, probably a tragedian. Cf. Canobbio (2011) ad loc.

⁴³² As at *Ep.* 4.49 (*laudant illa, sed ista legunt*) and 10.4 (*quid te vana iuvant miserae ludibria chartae?*), discussed in my first chapter. For a more detailed look at how this poem fits into Martial's poetics, cf. Canobbio (2011) intr. n. ad loc.

⁴³³ On γράψας vs. συγγράψας, see Rozema (1971) ad loc.. Also, it is not likely that Lucillius is just using shorthand (γράφας for συγγράψας) given that this poem appears in a sequence on painters.

⁴³⁴ These traits had become synonymous with *tonsors* by Martial's time. Suetonius tells us that Augustus' habitual shaves took long enough that he was able to read and write while he waited for the barber to finish (*Aug.* 79). Pliny the Elder, meanwhile, acknowledges the wounds that accompany a trip to the barber (*vulnera tonstrinarum*) when he gives a recipe for aftershave, or rather a poultice to staunch the bleeding (*NH* 29.114). On barbers at Rome, see J. Carcopino (1940) *Daily Life in Ancient Rome*. E.O. Lorimer, trans. New Haven: 157-64.

buzzing with flies already! Keep it up, and the vultures will join them.

Martial's (apparent) adaptation of this poem has long been noticed, but it still merits

further consideration (*Ep.* 11.84):

Qui nondum Stygias descendere quaerit ad umbras,
 tonsorem fugiat, si sapit, Antiochum.
 alba minus saevis lacerantur bracchia cultris,
 cum furit ad Phrygios enthea turba modos;
 mitior implicitas Alcon secatur enterocelas
 fractaque fabrili dedolat ossa manu.
 tondeat hic inopes Cynicos et Stoica menta
 collaque pulvere nudet equina iuba.
 hic miserum Scythica sub rupe Promethea radat,
 carnificem nudo pectore poscet avem;
 ad matrem fugiet Pentheus, ad Maenadas Orpheus,
 Antiochi tantum barbara tela sonent.
 haec quaecumque meo numeratis stigmata mento,
 in vetuli pyctae qualia fronte sedent,
 non iracundis fecit gravis unguibus uxor:
 Antiochi ferrum est et scelerata manus.
 unus de cunctis animalibus hircus habet cor:
 barbatus vivit, ne ferat Antiochum.

10

Whosoever is not yet ready to plumb the Stygian depths, if he has any sense, let him flee the barber Antiochus. Less cruelly do vicious knives slash white arms when the inspired mob raves to Phrygian strains. More gently does Alcon dissect thick-tangled hernias and shave down broken bones with his workman's hand. Let Antiochus carve up destitute Cynics and Stoic chins; let him strip horses' necks of their dusty manes. Let Antiochus shave wretched Prometheus beneath the Scythian crag and make him crave the torturous bird, chest laid bare. Pentheus will run to his mother, Orpheus to the Maenads, if they so much as hear Antiochus' brutal weapons ringing. These scars you count on my chin, the kind that sit on the forehead of an aged boxer, these weren't made by my dour wife's furious fingernails – no, it was the blade and wicked hand of Antiochus. The goat is the only animal with any sense: he lives with a beard so that he doesn't suffer Antiochus.

Structurally, these two poems bear few similarities, as Burnikel points out: Lucillius'

epigram expresses its narrator's illogical train of thought in three distinct couplets

rendered in the first person; Martial's epigram, meanwhile, triple the length of Lucillius',

is a rhetorical *tour de force*, combining mythological and contemporary references to

produce a hyperbolic third-person lament.⁴³⁵ These differences are telling: in much the

⁴³⁵ Burnikel (1980) 99-101. K. Barwick (1959) *Martial und die zeitgenössische Rhetorik*. Berlin, detects a tripartite structure common to both poems – the opening and concluding couplets make a single point (Lucillius: "stop cutting me, barber!", Martial: "avoid Antiochus"), which is disrupted by intervening material (Lucillius: "cut somewhere else", Martial: "here's how brutal Antiochus is"). Burnikel is not convinced (nor am I) that the structures are so similar: although Martial does frame the epigram using two couplets, to call his overall structure 'tripartite' is questionable.

same way as he did with the lawyer poem, here Martial has depersonalized the experience of Lucillius' narrator,⁴³⁶ although the effect in this case is not so much a coherent, dispassionate narrative as an impressive accumulation of examples emphasizing Antiochus' brutality. Consider also the first line of Lucillius' poem, a quote from the *Iliad* (5.455: Ἄρες Ἄρες βροτολοιγέ, μαιφόνε τειχεσιπλήτα). While the allusion to Ares well suits the dread κουρεύς, Lucillius leaves the mythic metaphor at that. Martial, on the other hand, seems to pick up the banner that his predecessor has dropped: taking his cue from Lucillius' Homeric quotation, he includes mythological references prominently throughout his long (if not epic) poem.⁴³⁷ As we have seen, Martial is hesitant to resort to myth in his poetry, and so its appearance here should call attention to itself. By using the stories of Prometheus, Pentheus, and Orpheus as devices for comic invective, Martial is imitating (and thereby respecting) Lucillius' own invective use of myth, while at the same time trumping his predecessor by sheer quantity of examples. Toward the end of the poem we encounter a final nod to imperial Greek epigram as Martial's narrator points out the scars Antiochus has inflicted upon his chin, *in vetuli pyctae qualia fronte sedent* (14). This comparison vividly recalls Lucillius' frequent mockery of battle-scarred boxers, right down to the Greek word *pyctes*.⁴³⁸ The narrator's suggestion that an onlooker might attribute his scars to an angry wife (*gravis uxor*) further narrows the allusion to a particular Lucillian poem, *AP* 11.79, in which the ex-boxer Cleombrotus retires from fighting only to face a far fiercer opponent at home than he ever did in the ring: his wife

⁴³⁶ Although Martial's narrator does make it known that he has first-hand experience of Antiochus' razor, pointing out the scars on his chin (ll. 13-4).

⁴³⁷ In *Ep.* 9.11 (discussed in my first chapter), Martial calls attention to the metrical license taken by Greek poets. Interestingly, his example is Ἄρες Ἄρες, the beginning of the very same line that Lucillius quotes.

⁴³⁸ The surviving boxer poems (*AP* 11.75-81) are attributed exclusively to Lucillius and seem to be a specialty of his.

(τὰ παρ' αὐτῷ / μᾶλλον ἰδεῖν φρίσσων ἢ ποτε τὸ στάδιον: “he’d much rather be in the ring than at home,” 3-4). This final bit of intertextuality on Martial’s part serves as a tacit acknowledgment of his predecessor’s work and rewards erudite readers who are familiar with it.

Equally interesting is how Martial seems to transform *AP* 190, also by Lucillius and also about a κουρεύς, but written at the expense of the client rather than the barber:

τὸν δασὺν Ἑρμογένη ζητεῖ πόθεν ἄρξεθ' ὁ κουρεύς
 κείρειν τὴν κεφαλὴν, ὄνθ' ὅλον ὡς κεφαλὴν.

Hairy Hermogenes’ barber is at a loss – where does his hair stop and his head begin?

Compare Martial’s own couplet on a barber and his hairy customer (*Ep.* 7.83):

Eutrapelus tonsor dum circuit ora Luperi
 expingitque genas, altera barba subit.

While the barber Eutrapelus was working his way around Luperus’ face and painting his cheeks, another beard sprouted.

The obvious difference here is that Martial’s poem mocks the *tonsor* Eutrapelus, while Lucillius targets Hermogenes, the recipient of the haircut, without even naming the barber himself. This is not, of course, the only distinction. For instance, the object of Lucillius’ satire is a physical (or spatial) shortcoming, Hermogenes’ hairiness, while Martial is satirizing a temporal quality, Eutrapelus’ slow pace. Likewise, Martial moves away from Lucillius’ focus on the head (κεφαλή) to a facial locale specific to beards, the mouth (*ora*) and cheek (*genae*) area, while at the same time introducing the emasculating practice of applying makeup (*expingit... genas*).⁴³⁹ These two epigrams are clearly distinct entities, then, but even so it is possible to argue that they are more closely related than their superficial thematic similarities would lead us to believe. First, both are only a

⁴³⁹ Some scholars have tried to stretch the meaning of *expingit* here to ‘depilate,’ but ‘paint’ seems sufficiently derogatory, without straining the sense of the word. Cf. Galán Vioque (2002) ad loc.

couplet in length, and they share a few key structural similarities: the hexameter of each is framed at the beginning by the name and a descriptor of the poem's target (τὸν δασὺν Ἑρμογένη / *Eutrapelus tonsor*), and at the end by a reference to the other party (ὁ κουρεὺς / *Luperci*); the pentameters are metrically identical, the first half of each consisting of a phrase enjambed over from the preceding clause (κείρειν τὴν κεφαλὴν / *expingitque genas*), and the second half providing the punchline (ὄνθ' ὅλον ὡς κεφαλὴν / *altera barba subit*). Moreover, the Greek name of Martial's barber is no coincidence: Eutrapelus, from the Greek adjective εὐτράπελος, means 'nimble,' which, as Galán Vioque points out, is an appropriately ironic appellation for such a slow worker; but the word can also have the sense of 'witty,' or 'quick to respond,' which we might read metapoetically as a descriptor of what Martial is doing with Lucillius' work.⁴⁴⁰ If we conclude from these observations that *Ep.* 7.83 can fairly be called an intentional Lucillian allusion, we will find a significant contribution to our understanding of Martial's playfully disruptive relationship with his predecessor. Martial retains the basic structure and theme of the Greek poem, but at the same time inverts the roles played by the two characters – he is indeed εὐτράπελος. Time and again we have seen this implicit contradiction, a reminder that even though Martial may have found the Greek model a worthy one, he himself will always have the last word.

III. Martial and the Mockery of Physical Qualities

It should be evident by now that Martial's mockery of professions interacts extensively with Lucillius' treatment of those same professions, in such a way that he simultaneously

⁴⁴⁰ For a discussion of the former sense, see Galán Vioque (2002) ad loc. For the latter, cf. *LSJ* s.v. εὐτράπελος A.2.

honors and attempts to trump his predecessor, much to the delight of learned readers. But the imperial Greek epigrammatists, both Lucillius and Nicarchus, did not limit their skoptic themes to practitioners of specialized jobs. Individuals with physical defects, ranging from the deformities of old age to the emission of foul odors from various orifices, were another common target for the Greeks, and Martial too has a particular penchant for this brand of invective.

Some of the most memorable Lucillian and Nicarchan poems are mordant, even downright cruel, attacks on old women. Martial in turn adapts several of these themes for his own epigrams. Consider first the following pair of couplets, by Lucillius and Martial respectively:

τὰς τρίχας, ὦ Νίκυλλα, τινὲς βάπτειν σε λέγουσιν,
ὥς σὺ μελαινοτάτας ἐξ ἀγορᾶς ἐπρίω.
(AP 11.68)

Some people say you dye your hair, Nicylla, but it was already black when you bought it.

Iurat capillos esse, quos emit, suos
Fabulla: numquid, Paule, peierat?
(Ep. 6.12)

Fabulla swears that the hair she buys is her own: how could she be lying, Paulus?

Burnikel's discussion of these two epigrams is especially illuminating. He first calls attention to the similarity between the names Νίκυλλα and Fabulla, and points out that both poems construct ironic defenses on behalf of their subjects – Nicylla against vicious popular rumor ("some people say..."), Fabulla against the charge of perjury. But, Burnikel argues, the form of each poem reveals how differently Lucillius and Martial create humor. Lucillius reveals critical new information about Nicylla's hair in the pentameter (she did *not* dye her hair, it was already black when she acquired it), but this information is casually delivered to us within a subordinate clause, such that the joke is

charmingly embedded within what Burnikel calls a “syntactic decrescendo.” Martial, meanwhile, makes no attempt to disprove the fact that Fabulla’s hair is store-bought, but rather introduces an interlocutor, Paulus, in order to call attention to the linguistic humor of the ambiguous possessive adjective *suos*: of course the hair is hers – she purchased it herself, didn’t she?⁴⁴¹ Although the groundwork he lays is important, Burnikel stops short of explaining what these differences in *Witztechnik* can tell us about Martial’s relationship with Lucillius *qua* Greek skoptic epigrammatist. In other words, what does Martial gain by changing the joke of his Lucillian model while keeping its theme? The change in addressee may be significant: whereas Lucillius speaks directly to the target, Martial addresses a third-party observer (analogous to one of the τινὲς in Lucillius’ epigram) who critically views Fabulla’s hair in much the same way as Martial might have viewed Lucillian poetry.⁴⁴² We can consider Martial’s intellectualization of the joke – that is, his reliance on semantics for humor rather than on the delivery of new and unexpected information – in much the same vein, given that it situates the Roman author in the privileged position of being able to analyze the punchline of the Lucillian poem (that Nicylla bought her hair) and then linguistically transform it into a separate joke in its own right. In other words, Martial relies upon Lucillius for his theme, but uses only half of Lucillius’ material (the purchase but not the dyeing) and still manages to be funny.

Martial does, however, address the secret shame of dyeing one’s hair, and again he uses Lucillius as his model. According to the current arrangement of the Greek Anthology, the Lucillian poem in question immediately follows the one just discussed

⁴⁴¹ On these two poems, see Burnikel (1980) 52–4.

⁴⁴² Needless to say, many of Martial’s epigrams are addressed to third-party observers, usually friends or patrons. That said, the Paulus here is probably fictional (cf. Grewing (1997) ad loc.), which makes Martial’s choice not to address his target all the more significant.

(*AP* 11.69):

τὰς πολιὰς βάψασα Θεμιστονόη τρικώρωνος
γίνεται ἐξαπίνης οὐ νέα, ἀλλὰ Ῥέα.

When the old crow Themistonoe dyes her hair, she immediately becomes... not so much young (νέα) as a regular Rhea (Ῥέα).

The joke lies in the dissonance between the rhyming pair νέα and Ῥέα (Lucillius is here invoking the goddess Rhea in her capacity as proverbial old woman).⁴⁴³ Whereas Themistonoe dyes her hair in an attempt to look young (νέα), she ultimately ends up looking old (Ῥέα), either because the dye is ineffective or because her dark hair now contrasts with other unflattering facial features. Mockery of those who dye their hair is relatively common in Greek skoptic epigram, but 11.69 has a particular resonance with Martial's own approach to the theme (*Ep.* 3.43):⁴⁴⁴

Mentiris iuvenem tinctis, Laetine, capillis,
tam subito corvus, qui modo cycnus eras.
non omnes fallis; scit te Proserpina canum:
personam capiti detrahet illa tuo.

You pretend you're young by dyeing your hair, Laetinus – one moment you're a swan, the next a raven. But not everyone is duped: Proserpina knows you've gone grey. She'll rip the mask from your head.

A comparison of this poem and Lucillius' will suggest a deliberate and playfully contrarian adaptation on Martial's part.⁴⁴⁵ On a general level, both epigrams make the

⁴⁴³ Rhea's status as wife of Cronos and mother of the gods makes her a suitable representative for old age. Rozema (1971: ad loc.) also points the common identification of Rhea with Cybele, the "mother of all" (as at *Ov. Fast.* 4.201), which enhances her status as aged matriarch.

⁴⁴⁴ Poems referencing hair dye in the Greek Anthology include 5.76, 11.66-8, 11.256, 11.310, and 11.374. The theme appeared in Roman poetry as well (e.g. *Prop.* 1.2 and 2.18b; *Ov. Am.* 1.14, *Ars* 3.163ff.); cf. Fusi (2006) intr. n. ad 3.43.

⁴⁴⁵ Another poem, *AP* 11.408, attributed to Lucian, bears even closer parallels to *Ep.* 3.43:

Τὴν κεφαλὴν βάπτεις, τὸ δὲ γῆρας οὐποτε βάψεις,
οὐδὲ παρειῶν ἐκτανύσεις ρυτίδας.
μὴ τοίνυν τὸ πρόσωπον ἅπαν ψιμύθῳ κατάπλαττε,
ὥστε προσωπεῖον κοῦχι πρόσωπον ἔχειν.
οὐδὲν γὰρ πλέον ἐστί. τί μαίνεαι; οὐποτε φῶκος
καὶ ψιμυθος τεύξει τὴν Ἑκάβην Ἑλένην.

You dye your hair, but you'll never dye your old age, or smooth out the wrinkles on your cheeks. So don't slather your whole face with plaster, so that it looks more like a mask than a face. There's no point. Don't be crazy – makeup will never turn Hecuba into Helen.

same point: changing your hair color does not change your age. To be sure, Lucillius focuses more on the inefficacy of Themistonoe's dye job, while Martial emphasizes the fact that Laetinus successfully deceives almost everyone, with the important exception of Proserpina, who knows the truth and will eventually reveal it, much to Laetinus' chagrin. But these thematic differences are counterbalanced by some convincing potential allusions. We find, for example, Lucillius' epithet *τρικόρωνος* ("thrice a crow's age") echoed by Martial's comparison of Laetinus to a raven (*corvus*), although the Roman poet irreverently upends his predecessor's metaphor – whereas *τρικόρωνος* implies great age, *corvus* suggests black hair and, by association, youth. Both Lucillius and Martial also invoke a female deity to form their respective punchlines, and indeed both goddesses represent the unhappy culmination of the dyer's efforts: Themistonoe winds up looking ancient like Rhea, and Laetinus' deception is exposed by Proserpina. But once again, Martial also implements an inversion: Rhea serves as an exemplar of old age and Themistonoe's resemblance to her is apparent to everyone, while Proserpina is a young goddess (mythologically speaking) who is ironically one of the few (*non omnes fallis*) who can see through Laetinus' facade. We can conclude from these allusions that Martial is having a bit of fun with the Lucillian poem – he makes a similar point using similar imagery, but his use of this imagery is calculatedly opposed to that of Lucillius. A final observation is worth making: despite the playfulness of his adaptation, Martial's punchline, essentially a promise of impending death, is significantly darker than

Rozema (1971: 239-50) presents a careful discussion of the pseudo-Lucianic epigrams in Book 11 and their potential Lucillian authorship. 11.408 is one of five such poems that he is confident enough to attribute (with a good deal of caution) to Lucillius. Burnikel (1980: 48-52) follows Rozema in this attribution, and accordingly discusses 11.408 as a precursor to *Ep.* 3.43. Fusi (2006: ad loc.) in his turn follows Burnikel. For my part, I am less confident that 11.408 predates Martial – it is no less likely to have been influenced by him as he is to have been influenced by it. Therefore, I have decided to exclude this poem from my study and instead focus on the more solidly attributed (but equally interesting) 11.69.

Lucillius' more lighthearted wordplay. Clearly, then, Martial's attitude toward death, as we have seen earlier and in previous chapters, is not always as cavalier as Lucillius'.

I turn now from death to deformity. The imperial Greek epigrammatists made much of physical anomalies unrelated to age, ranging from amazing thinness (a favorite topic of Lucillius, as at *AP* 11.88-95) to excessive height (*AP* 11.87, also by Lucillius) to misshapen noses (*AP* 11.406, by Nicarchus). Martial was no less willing to mock such qualities (cf. 3.98 on a grotesquely lean *culus*, 8.60 on the colossal Claudia, and 12.88 on Tongilianus' massive nose, literal, figurative, or both), but one pair of poems deserves special attention. First, we have Lucillius' epigram on Demosthenis and her relationship with her mirror (*AP* 11.266):

Ψευδὲς ἔσοπτρον ἔχει Δημοσθενίς· εἰ γὰρ ἀληθὲς
ἔβλεπεν, οὐκ ἂν ὅλως ᾔθελεν αὐτὸ βλέπειν.

Demosthenis' mirror is a liar: if she saw what was really there, she would never look into it again.

Martial's version of this theme is presented as a brief but vivid narrative (*Ep.* 12.83):

Derisor Fabianus hirnearum,
omnes quem modo colei timebant
dicentem tumidas in hydrocelas
quantum nec duo dicerent Catulli,
in thermis subito Neronianis
vidit se miser et tacere coepit.

Fabianus, mocker of hernias, not long ago an object of terror for testicles everywhere with his speeches against swollen scrotums, more than a match for two Catulluses,⁴⁴⁶ had the bad luck of seeing himself suddenly in Nero's baths. That shut him up.

Here, rather than alluding directly to Lucillius' poem, Martial transforms its theme into something befitting his epigrammatic 'Roman' world. Lucillius' point is straightforward and succinct: Demosthenis' mirror must be lying, or else she couldn't stand to look at her

⁴⁴⁶ Equated by Shackleton Bailey (1993) not with the famous poet, but with a similarly-named author of mimes. Cf. Wiseman (1987) 192; E. Fantham (2011) *Roman Readings: Roman Response to Greek Literature from Plautus to Statius and Quintilian*. Berlin: 233-4 (from Chapter 10: "Mime: The missing link in Roman literary history").

(presumably ugly) reflection in it. The humor comes from the personification of the mirror and the resulting insult to Demosthenis' physical appearance. Martial then appropriates this motif of a person not liking his or her reflection, and through the addition of specific narrative details turns it into a distinctly Roman piece of invective.

In terms of setting, the private context for the Lucillian poem, a bedroom (or some other part of Demosthenis' home where she would have a mirror), is changed by Martial into the most public of Roman locales, the baths of Nero (*in thermis Neronianis*). Martial's choice of main character is equally Romanizing: his analog for Lucilius' Greek Demosthenis is Fabianus, whose name recalls one of the most ancient patrician families of Rome. Interestingly, however, Fabianus is also something of an orator, perhaps a veiled homage on Martial's part to Lucilius' Demosthenis, who, while almost certainly not a public speaker, nevertheless (almost) shares a name with the most famous one of all. Moreover, Martial compares Fabianus' skill to that of at least two Catulluses. The mere mention of this name, whether in reference to the neoteric or the mimographer, and whether or not these were the same person, recalls Martial's much-vaunted Latin epigrammatic pedigree, for which Catullus is the progenitor. Indeed, by rating his target's invective skill above not one but two Catulluses, Martial ironically aligns Fabianus, mocker of hernias and vanquisher of the mimographer Catullus, with himself, mocker of Fabianus and vanquisher of the epigrammatist Catullus. And Fabianus certainly does signify Martial's mastery of the obscene Latin epigram, given the grotesque nature of his chosen subject (*hirneae, colei, hydrocelae*). The punchline of the poem, however, abruptly deflates any idealistic comparison between Fabianus and Martial, as Fabianus is shocked into silence by his reflection in the baths: he, too, has a

hydrocele and has thus been exposed as a hypocrite. Of course this notion of self-contradiction is nothing new to a reader of Martial's *Epigrams*, and so his association with Fabianus might include an amusing bit of self-deprecation – the only difference is that Martial never shuts up.

In short, then, Martial has taken the theme of his Lucillian model and transformed it into a very Roman poem in which he can playfully allude to his relationship with his Latin predecessor Catullus. But what can this adaptation tell us about Martial's relationship with his *Greek* predecessor? In a final touch of irony, William Fitzgerald's observations on Martial's banalization of Catullus might shed some light on how he relates to Lucillius here. As Fitzgerald points out, "Whether in the scoptic or the panegyric mode..., Martial reads Catullus from the perspective of his own very different world, and this brings Catullus's casual assumptions into question."⁴⁴⁷ Martial's engagement with the above Lucillian epigram is similar: he has converted Demosthenis' private glance at her mirror into something more suited to the sordid, public Rome found throughout the *Epigrams*.⁴⁴⁸ In the process, he so thoroughly overwrites his Greek model that the poem becomes an implicit competition with his Latin predecessor instead.

This is not to say that Greek skoptic epigrams did not deal in the sordid as well. A popular satirical theme, taken up by both Lucillius and Nicarchus, was the emission of foul odors from various (or unspecified) body parts.⁴⁴⁹ In one poem, Lucillius uses the technique of *cumulatio* to mock the stench of a certain Telesilla (*AP* 11.239):

⁴⁴⁷ Fitzgerald (2007): 173. On Martial's banalization and recontextualization of Catullus, see Fitzgerald: 167-86 and Lorenz (2010).

⁴⁴⁸ To be sure, by virtue of writing a poem on the subject, Lucillius has made his mockery of Demosthenis public. The difference is that Fabianus' actions are public from the start, and Martial can simply sit back and provide commentary.

⁴⁴⁹ Mockery of body odors was common in earlier Latin poetry as well (e.g. Cat. 69, Hor. *Sat.* 1.2.27). Cf. Moreno Soldevila (2006) intr. n. ad loc.

οὔτε Χίμαιρα τοιοῦτον ἔπνει κακὸν ἢ καθ' Ὅμηρον
οὐκ ἀγέλη ταύρων, ὥς ὁ λόγος, πυρίπνους,
οὐ Λῆμνος σύμπασα, καὶ Ἀρπυιῶν τὰ περισσά,
οὐδ' ὁ Φιλοκτήτου πούς ἀποσηπόμενος·
ὥστε σε παμνηφεὶ νικᾶν, Τελέσιλλα, Χιμαίρας,
σηπεδόνας, ταύρους, ὄρνεα, Λημνιάδας.

The Homeric Chimaera's breath is no worse, nor the herd of (allegedly) fire-breathing bulls, nor the whole throng of Lemnian women,⁴⁵⁰ nor the Harpies' leftovers, nor Philoctetes' rotting foot. It's unanimous, Telesilla, you outstink them all: Chimaeras, decay, bulls, birds, and Lemnians alike.

This hyper-accumulation of examples is borrowed and even amplified by Martial in his own attack on a foul-smelling woman (*Ep.* 4.4):

Quod sicca redolet palus lacuna,
crudarum nebulae quod Albularum,
piscinae vetus aura quod marinae,
quod pressa piger hircus in capella,
lassi vardaicus quod evocati, 5
quod bis murice vellus inquinatum,
quod ieiunia sabbatariorum,
maestorum quod anhelitus reorum,
quod spurcae moriens lucerna Ledaе,
quod ceromata faece de Sabina, 10
quod volpis fuga, viperae cubile,
mallem quam quod oles olere, Bassa.

The stench of a dried-up swamp, or the sulfuric fumes of the Albulae, or the rancid odor of a fish pond, or a sluggish billygoat atop his mate, or the boot of a weary veteran, or fleece twice dyed in *murex*, or Jewish women's fasting,⁴⁵¹ or the panting gasps of wretched defendants, or foul Leda's dying lamp, or unguents made from Sabine dregs, or a fox's refuge, or a viper's den: I would rather smell any of these than you, Bassa.

Both of these poems describe a particular woman's unpleasant odor by way of a hyperbolic priamel, listing a variety of tremendously unappealing smells only to conclude that the woman in question surpasses them all. Neither poet explicitly describes the source of his subject's stench, although clues in each poem suggest that bad breath is a distinct possibility.⁴⁵² The ways in which Martial modifies his Lucillian model are

⁴⁵⁰ The Lemnian women were proverbially ill-smelling. Cf. Rozema (1971) ad loc.

⁴⁵¹ The result of which would be bad breath.

⁴⁵² To that end, Burnikel (1980: 33) points out how Lucilius links the harmful (but not necessarily foul-smelling) breath of the Chimaera (ἔπνει) and Colchian bulls (πυρίπνους) with more traditional (but not breath-related) sources of foul odor. In Martial's case, according to Moreno Soldevila (2006: intr. n. ad loc.), we might conclude that Bassa has the breath of a *fellatrix*, given the allusions to a copulating goat (4) and the prostitute Leda (9). In *Ep.* 6.69, Bassa (along with her daughter) is explicitly a *fellatrix*.

especially interesting. Burnikel once again provides a good analysis of the structural differences between the two poems. Martial's poem is precisely twice as long as Lucilius', and he uses twelve examples to Lucilius' five. Further, whereas Lucilius enumerates his examples in a series of simple clauses, Martial couches his in a long sequence of subordinate clauses introduced by the relative pronoun *quod* – this in turn creates a sense of mounting anticipation, which is resolved only at the end of the poem. According to Burnikel, these changes reveal Martial's respect for the basic theme of the Lucillian original, but also show his eagerness to engage in a virtuosic degree of structural and rhetorical innovation.⁴⁵³

Martial's adaptation of *AP* 11.239 is not, of course, a purely structural phenomenon – he also rewrites its content in telling ways. Most conspicuously, Lucilius' mythological comparisons are abandoned in favor of examples borrowed from real life.⁴⁵⁴ This change should come as no surprise given Martial's professed preference for reality over mythology, as has been discussed on numerous occasions above. Moreover, many of Martial's examples, beyond being simply realistic, are specific to the reality of life in and around Rome, and would no doubt have struck chords with his readers in a way that Lucilius' myths never could. The *nebulae Alburarum* (2), for example, were a therapeutic cold (now hot) spring near Tibur; the *vardaicus evocati* (5) evokes the image of a long-standing Roman soldier; the sight of the *ieiunia sabbatariarum* (7), however misunderstood, would have been familiar to many Roman readers; desperate defendants (*maestorum anhelitus reorum* 8) were surely a common sight in the Forum; many a

⁴⁵³ Burnikel (1980: 34-7).

⁴⁵⁴ This observation was made as early as Prinz (1911: 77).

prostitute might have been named Leda (9), perhaps even anointed with oils straight from Sabinium (*faece de Sabina* 10).⁴⁵⁵ Martial has effectively transformed a Greek poem steeped in Greek mythology into a Roman poem bound to Roman reality. In the process, he depicts the foul smells of Rome and Italy so vividly that for any Roman audience his invective becomes all the more damning.

Nicarchus, like his contemporary Lucilius, had his own group of epigrams attacking those who emitted foul odors. Especially memorable is the following poem (*AP* 11.241):

ὁ στόμα χὼ πρῶκτὸς ταῦτόν, Θεόδωρε, σοῦ ὄζει,
ὥστε διαγνῶναι τοῖς φυσικοῖς καλὸν ἦν.
ἢ γράψαι σε ἔδει, ποῖον στόμα, ποῖον ὁ πρῶκτὸς·
νῦν δὲ λαλοῦντός σου <βδεῖν σ' ἐνόμιζον ἐγώ>.⁴⁵⁶

Your mouth and your asshole smell the same, Theodorus; in fact, it would take a team of biologists to tell the difference. You should really label which one is the mouth and which one is the asshole; as things are, whenever you talk, I think you're farting.

Nicarchus' joke, reliant on the unexpected (and comic) confoundment of στόμα and πρῶκτὸς, is clear, and it is one that Martial makes time and again, usually with even more derogatory implications, as we shall see. Although there is little clear evidence that Martial borrows directly from this poem, his development of the theme is noteworthy, as the following epigram demonstrates (*Ep.* 1.83):

os et labra tibi lingit, Manneia, catellus:
non miror, merdas si libet esse cani.

Your puppy licks your mouth and lips, Manneia. I'm not surprised: dogs love eating shit.

Here, Martial resonantly echoes Nicarchus' στόμα-πρῶκτὸς pair by comparing the unfortunate Manneia's mouth to *merda*. Martial's innovation is that he implies (much more forcefully than Nicarchus) an unsavory reason for this comparison; namely, that

⁴⁵⁵ For detailed discussion of all of these examples, see Morano Soldevila (2006) ad loc.

⁴⁵⁶ The last half of the pentameter is supplied by Jacobs (1794-1814). For a fuller discussion, see Schatzmann (2012) 347-8.

Manneia engages in abnormal sexual behavior with his mouth.⁴⁵⁷ Later epigrams

reinforce this notion that the odor of a person's mouth can expose his or her lifestyle for all to see – or smell (*Ep.* 12.85, 2.12):

pediconibus os olere dicis.
hoc si, sicut ais, Fabulle, verum est:
quid tu credis olere cunnilingis?

You claim that sodomites' mouths smell, Fabullus. But if what you say is true, where do you think cunt-lickers smell?

esse quid hoc dicam, quod olent tua basia murram
quodque tibi est numquam non alienus odor?
hoc mihi suspectum est, quod oles bene, Postume, semper:
Postume, non bene olet qui bene semper olet.

What should I make of the fact that your kisses smell like myrrh, and that you never have your own odor? I find it odd, Postumus, that you always smell good. Postumus, a person who always smells good doesn't really smell good.

These two poems reflect Martial's surprisingly frequent assumption that bad breath was probably the result of fellatio or cunnilingus, to the extent that he suspects even those with good breath of concealing an *os impurum*.⁴⁵⁸ This attitude, of course, is not unique to Martial, and there was a strong preexisting Roman belief that the mouth (and consequently the breath) was contaminated or tainted by contact with genitalia, whether male or female.⁴⁵⁹ Indeed, if we consider an earlier epigram by Catullus, which directly links bad breath and sexuality, we are brought full circle (*Cat.* 97.1-4, 9-12):

Non (ita me di ament) quicquam referre putavi,
utrumne os an culum olfacerem Aemilio.
nilo mundius hoc, niloque immundius illud,
verum etiam culus mundior et melior:
...
hic futuit multas et se facit esse venustum,
et non pistrino traditur atque asino?

⁴⁵⁷ Whether this behavior is fellatio, cunnilingus, or anilingus is unclear. Citroni (1975) intr. n. ad loc. leans toward fellatio, and makes no mention of anilingus, perhaps due to the infrequency (or rather absence) of its explicit appearance in Martial's oeuvre.

⁴⁵⁸ The theme is pervasive in the *Epigrams*, with both male and female targets (e.g. 2.42, 2.50, 2.61, 3.75, 6.50, 11.30). As we find in 2.12, often the *os impurum* manifests in social kissing, to which Martial has a notorious aversion. Cf. Sullivan (1990) 202-3.

⁴⁵⁹ For an excellent overview, see Richlin (1992) 26-31.

quem siqua attingit, non illam posse putemus
aegroti culum lingere carnificis?

God help me, It makes no difference whether I smell Aemilius' mouth or asshole. The latter is no cleaner, and the former is no dirtier – actually, the asshole is probably cleaner and more pleasant. ... This guy fucks many a lady and makes himself out to be charming, and yet he isn't handed over to the grinding mill and its ass? It's a safe bet that any woman who touches him would be capable of licking a diseased executioner's asshole.

As it turns out, Nicarchus' στόμα-πρωκτὸς dichotomy may have itself been borrowed from Catullus' *os-culus* dichotomy in this poem – the theme is essentially the same, although Catullus condemns Aemilius' bad breath with a good deal more vigor.

Interestingly, Catullus' conclusion here incorporates a sexual dimension, which seems to cement the implication that Aemilius' mouth is not merely malodorous but an *os impurum*, something about which Nicarchus is not nearly as explicit. Martial, a successor to both Catullus and Nicarchus, in his turn invokes their chosen invective topic (mouth-anus confusion) early on in the *Epigrams*, and then returns again and again, more and more explicitly, to the sexual implications of this theme. By deploying the trope in this way, Martial effectively compels his reader to go back to the earlier poets and think about their epigrams in even more obscene terms, especially Nicarchus, whose omission of explicit sexual obscenity is glaring in light of his apparent Catullan model. But for Martial, Nicarchus' Theodorus will not get off that easily – his mouth is no cleaner than those of his Roman counterparts.

IV. Martial and the Mockery of Moral Qualities

Sometimes, however, the Greek imperial epigrammatists were more forthright in their criticism of socially unacceptable lifestyles, which brings us to our third and last thematic classification for skoptic epigram: the mockery of undesirable moral qualities. To

continue the discussion on Nicarchus, Martial, and sexual obscenity, I turn first to a particularly well-known Nicarchan poem, whose irreverent manipulation of Homeric material recalls Martial's own (*AP* 11.328):

Τὴν μίαν Ἑρμογένης κάγώ ποτε καὶ Κλεόβουλος
 ἤγομεν εἰς κοινὴν Κύπριν Ἀριστοδίκεν·
 ἧς ἔλαχον μὲν ἐγὼ πολὴν ἄλλα ναιέμεν αὐτός·
 εἷς γὰρ ἔν, οὐ πάντες πάντα, διειλόμεθα.
 Ἑρμογένης δ' ἔλαχε στυγερὸν δόμον εὐρώεντα,
 ὕστατον, εἰς ἀφανῇ χῶρον ὑπερχόμενος,
 ἔνθ' ἅκται νεκύων καὶ ἔρинеοὶ ἠνεμόεντες
 δινεῦνται πνοιῇ δυσκελάδων ἀνέμων.
 Ζῆνα δὲ θεὸς Κλεόβουλον, ὃς οὐρανὸν εἰσαναβαίνειν,
 τὸ ψολόεν κατέχων ἐν χερὶ πῦρ, ἔλαχεν.
 γῇ δ' ἔμενε ξυνὴ πάντων· ψίαθον γὰρ ἐν αὐτῇ
 στρώσαντες τὴν γραῦν ὧδε διειλόμεθα.

10

Once upon a time Hermogenes and I and Cleoboulos enjoyed the lone Aristodike in common lovemaking. Lots were drawn, and I drew the right “to dwell within her surging sea” – we split her up, you see, one part for each of us, not a free-for-all. Hermogenes drew her “loathsome dank chamber” (the hindmost lot) and delved into the sightless land, where tower the crags of the dead and where the “blowing fig trees” are battered by the blasts of ill-sounding winds. Make Cleoboulos our Zeus: he drew the right “to ascend to the heavens,” gripping in his hand his smoking thunderbolt. “The earth remained common for all,” for we threw down a mat and split the old woman on the spot.

Nicarchus has brilliantly applied quotations from a military epic to a new and unabashedly sexual epic, in which the main players (like the gods) divide their woman (like the world) into three domains.⁴⁶⁰ The effect of such comic treatment is to encourage the reader not merely to laugh at Nicarchus’ cleverness, but to reconsider his Homeric original from an obscene perspective, a shift which deals a strong blow to Homer’s lofty reputation. Martial, as I discussed at the end of my first chapter, does much the same thing with his own allusions to Homer, and this technical similarity to Nicarchus is noteworthy in and of itself – Martial’s relationship with early Greek poets may well have been shaped by how the imperial Greek epigrammatists positioned themselves *vis-à-vis*

⁴⁶⁰ For an exhaustive discussion of the particular allusions to the *Iliad* (especially Book 15), see Schatzmann (2012) ad loc. For analysis of the poem, see Nisbet (2003: 82-5), who concludes that “Nikarkhos... is an earthier skoptic poet [than Lucilius], with a relish for inventive playground rudeness on bodily functions.” Whether or not it is safe to generalize based on the few epigrams that survive, Nisbet’s assessment of the Nicarchus we see here is quite accurate.

those same poets. But equally noteworthy is Martial's distinctive approach to the '*femina est omnis divisa in partes tres*' theme. A passing remark from Book 9 may constitute an oblique allusion to Nicarchus' epigram (*Ep.* 9.32.4): *hanc volo quae pariter sufficit una tribus* ("I want a girl who is by herself a match for three men at once").⁴⁶¹ A later poem, from Book 11, is more detailed, although this version describes only two men to Nicarchus' three (*Ep.* 11.81):

cum sene communem vexat spado Dindymus Aeglen,
et iacet in medio sicca puella toro.
viribus hic, operi non est hic utilis annis:
ergo sine effectu prurit utrique labor.
supplex illa rogat pro se miserisque duobus,
hunc iuvenem facias, hunc, Cytherea, virum.

The eunuch Dindymus along with an old man are wearing out Aegle (in common), and the girl lies dry in the middle of the bed. They aren't up to the task, one for lack of potency and the other for abundance of years: and so both of them struggle and lust in vain. She prays, both for herself and for the two wretches, Cytherea, that you make one a young man and the other just a man.

This epigram is not so similar to that of Nicarchus as to demand an argument for direct textual imitation on Martial's part: in particular, the *ménage à quatre* is reduced to a *ménage à trois*, and the mythological allusions are lost. Even so, the expression *communem Aeglen* recalls the idea conveyed by Nicarchus' εἰς κοινὴν Κύπριν, and Martial does introduce Venus at the end of his poem as the recipient of Aegle's prayers, using the appellation *Cytherea* in contrast to Nicarchus' Κύπρις. If we assume for a moment that Martial might have had *AP* 11.328 in mind while writing this epigram, a remarkable transformation crystallizes. Nicarchus' three heroes, godlike in their sexual potency (even the hapless Hermogenes, who like Hades drew an unfavorable lot), are reduced to two profoundly impotent fools, who would require divine intervention just to satisfy their woman at all. Just as Nicarchus cuts Homer down to size, so does Martial

⁴⁶¹ Schatzmann (2012) 328.

cut Nicarchus down to size, changing his sexual epic into a comedy of errors. This is funny, of course, but Martial also lands a tacit blow to the dignity (parodic though it may have been) of his Greek model.

The question of dignity brings us to the following pair of epigrams by Nicarchus and Martial, both of which ask the question, “What’s in a name?”:⁴⁶²

AP 11.17:

Ἦν Στέφανος πτωχὸς κηπεύς θ' ἄμα· νῦν δὲ προκόψας
 πλουτεῖ καὶ γεγένητ' εὐθὺ Φιλοστέφανος,
 τέσσαρα τῷ πρώτῳ Στεφάνῳ καλὰ γράμματα προσθείς·
 ἔσται δ' εἰς ὥρας Ἱπποκρατιπιάδης
 ἢ διὰ τὴν σπατάλην Διονυσιοπηγανόδωρος·
 ἐν δ' ἀγορανομίῳ παντὶ μένει Στέφανος.

Stephanus was both a beggar and a gardener, but now that he’s advanced in life and made some money, he’s suddenly become “Philostephanus” – he added four fine letters to the beginning of his name. Before you know it he’ll be “Hippocratippiades,” or, shameless as he is, “Dionysiopeganodorus.” But in the forum he’ll always remain Stephanus.

Ep. 6.17:

Cinnam, Cinname, te iubes vocari.
 non est hic, rogo, Cinna, barbarismus?
 tu si Furius ante dictus esses,
 Fur ista ratione dicereris.

Cinnamus, you tell us to call you Cinna. I ask you, Cinna, isn’t this a barbarism? By the same logic, if you had been called Furius before, now we’d call you Fur.

Here we have a pair of individuals who alter their names in a fruitless effort to gain prestige. Nicarchus narrates the tale of Stephanus’ glorious transformation into the wealthy Philostephanus, providing some over-the-top speculation about future name changes before cutting him back down to size in the final line. Martial’s story, to the extent that it actually is a story, describes Cinnamus’ metamorphosis into Cinna, concluding with a joke about the reckless subtraction of letters from one’s name.

Mathematics is one of the main differences between these two epigrams: Nicarchus offers a system of (attempted) glorification through the addition of letters, while Martial’s

⁴⁶² Cf. also Sullivan 90-1.

system requires the subtraction of letters. Interestingly, Martial's Cinnamus has a Greek name,⁴⁶³ and it is only by removing letters that he tries, and fails, to lay claim to being Roman. Reading this metapoetically, we might imagine Martial to be making a statement about the dangers of modifying – specifically, shrinking – a Greek original for a Roman context. At best such a procedure is utterly foreign (*barbarismus* 2), and at worst it is self-defeating or even plagiarizing, as the *Furius* to *Fur* example – a move away from a famous name and toward an ignominious one – demonstrates. There is an obvious irony in such a claim, given that shrinking a Greek original is exactly what Martial himself is doing with this epigram, reducing Nicarchus' six-line poem into a four-line one. Perhaps Martial is acknowledging here some of the risks involved in adapting a Greek poem for a Latin-speaking audience. At the same time, after reading Martial's poem, we might look back at the Nicarchus epigram as itself a commentary on poetics – sometimes, the narrator seems to say, less is more, a thoroughly Callimachean ideal. Does this mean that Martial, by reversing Nicarchus' terms, is rejecting an aesthetic of refined poetics? Of course not, especially given that he ironizes the whole situation by failing to practice what he preaches. If anything, Martial's overt disagreement and covert agreement with the Nicarchan model might reflect his conflicted desire to simultaneously repress and appreciate his Greek models.

Nicarchus is not the only skoptic epigrammatist who took an interest in how certain types of people wanted themselves to be portrayed. Lucillius too addresses this question in several poems mocking Cynics, one of which seems to have been a direct influence on Martial (*AP* 11.153):

⁴⁶³ See Shackleton Bailey (1993) ad. loc.

Εἶναι μὲν κυνικόν σε, Μενέστρατε, κάνυπόδητον
καὶ ῥιγοῦν οὐδείς ἀντιλέγει καθόλου·
ἂν δὲ παραρπάξης ἄρτους καὶ κλάσματ' ἀναιδῶς,
κἀγὼ ῥάβδον ἔχω, καὶ σὲ λέγουσι κύνα.

Absolutely nobody contests that you're a Cynic, Menestratus, barefoot and shivering. But if you shamelessly swipe loaves and crumbs... I have a stick, and they call you a dog.

The joke, of course, hinges upon the popular derivation of the word κυνικός from κύων – if Menestratus keeps up his thievery, promises the narrator, he will be beaten like the dog he is. Martial uses this etymology in the punchline of his own epigram on the same theme (*Ep.* 4.53):

hunc, quem saepe vides intra penetralia nostrae
Pallados et templi limina, Cosme, novi
cum baculo peraque senem, cui cana putrisque
stat coma et in pectus sordida barba cadit,
cerea quem nudi tegit uxor abolla grabati,
cui dat latratos obvia turba cibos,
esse putas Cynicum deceptus imagine ficta:
non est hic Cynicus, Cosme: quid ergo? canis.

This man, whom you often see loitering around our Pallas' shrine and the threshold of the new temple, Cosmus, the old man with his staff and satchel, whose hair bristles gray and foul, whose filthy beard cascades down to his chest, who's covered by a paper-thin mantle (the wife of his bare cot), to whom the passing crowd gives bark-worthy scraps, you think that he's a Cynic, but you've been fooled by a false likeness. This man is no Cynic, Cosmus. What is he, then? A dog.

Martial's joke, like Lucillius,' links *Cynicus* and *canis*, although here the Cynic's physical and behavioral similarities to a dog are stressed, rather than the dog-like punishment he might receive. In spite of the common wordplay, modern scholarship has remained ambivalent about the degree to which these poems are connected, especially in light of an earlier epigram by Antipater of Sidon whose similarities to Martial's are more pronounced.⁴⁶⁴ Nevertheless, most scholars have argued that the poems of Lucillius and

⁴⁶⁴ The most forceful proponent of this view is Autore (1937: 86-8). The poem in question is *AP* 11.158:

Αἰάζει πῆρη τε καὶ Ἡράκλειον ἄριστον
βριθὲ Σινωπίτου Διογένης ῥόπαλον
καὶ τὸ χύδην ῥυπόεντι πίνῃ πεπαλαγμένον ἔσθος
διπλάδιον, κρυερῶν ἀντίπαλον νιφάδων,
ὅττι τεοῖς ὅμοισι μιαίνεται· ἦ γὰρ ὁ μὲν που

Martial are indeed related, including Burnikel, who finds the punchlines too similar to ignore. Burnikel's comparison of the epigrams is illuminating. The primary difference, he argues, is one of intent: Lucillius' interest is in playing an ironic game with Menestratus' double identity as both a philosopher and a dog, whereas Martial is less concerned with making the dog analogy (the only real parallel is *latratos cibos*) than with exposing the Cynic's facade.⁴⁶⁵

In pointing out that the wit of Martial's punchline is enervated somewhat by its loose ties to the rest of the poem, Burnikel makes a compelling observation, one worth considering in the same terms I have analyzed earlier epigrams – namely, we should ask what this change can tell us about Martial's relationship with Lucillius. Why, in other words, does Martial transform Lucillius' brief joke at the expense of a Cynic who ironically resembles his namesake into a lengthy (in fact, exactly twice as long) diatribe against shameless hypocrisy, perhaps even at the expense of precise humor?⁴⁶⁶ One reason may be political: Cynics were expelled from Rome under Vespasian and again under Domitian (in 93, after the publication of this poem).⁴⁶⁷ Moreno Soldevila suggests that the attack “must be taken as a sign of adherence to the established regime.”⁴⁶⁸

Certainly this would have lent more immediacy to Martial's theme than probably would have motivated Lucillius, but both poets were writing in a long tradition of anti-Cynic

οὐράνιος, σὺ δ' ἔφυς οὖν σποδιῇσι κύων.
ἀλλὰ μέθες, μέθες ὅπλα τὰ μὴ σέθεν· ἄλλο λεόντων,
ἄλλο γενειητῶν ἔργον ὄρωρε τράγων.

The satchel laments, as does Sinopean Diogenes' excellent sturdy Heracleian club, and the double cloak, bespattered all over with foul dirt, striving against frigid clouds; all of these lament because they're polluted by your shoulders. No doubt Diogenes is the dog of heaven, but you're the dog lying in the ashes. So take off, take off the arms that aren't yours: the work of lions is one thing, the work of bearded goats another.

⁴⁶⁵ Burnikel (1980) 43-8.

⁴⁶⁶ Salemme (1976: 77-80) suggests that “the achievement of this poem is not the description of the Cynic, which is far from original, or the final wordplay, but its attention to detail, its innovative expressions, and echoes from Augustan literature.” Quoted in Moreno Soldevila (2006) 374.

⁴⁶⁷ On the former, cf. Dio Cass. 67.13; on the latter, cf. Suet. *Dom.* 10.3-5.

⁴⁶⁸ Moreno Soldevila (2006) 373.

literature, so politics can offer only a partial explanation. We might also consider Martial's distinction between fiction and reality – one is *either* a true philosopher *or* a dog – as a passing jab at Lucilius, who makes no such distinction – Menestratus is *both* a philosopher *and* a dog. Perhaps Martial is exposing not only his subject's hypocrisy but also his predecessor's ignorance to such hypocrisy, which is quite the claim to perceptive superiority: Martial, unlike Lucilius, is capable of seeing things as they truly are.

Thievery in the Greek Anthology was not limited to Cynics. Commonplace burglars were also the target of skoptic epigrams, such as this one by Lucilius (AP 11.176):

Τὸν πτανὸν Ἑρμῆν, τὸν θεῶν ὑπηρέταν,
τὸν Ἀρκάδων ἄνακτα, τὸν βοηλάταν,
ἐστῶτα τῶνδε γυμνασίων ἐπίσκοπον,
ὁ νυκτικλέπτας Αὔλος εἶπε βαστάσας·
„Πολλοὶ μαθηταὶ κρείσσονες διδασκάλων.”

The winged Hermes, attendant of the gods, lord of the Arcadians, swiper of cattle, who stood here as guardian of this gymnasium, the night-thief Aulus stole, saying, “Many students are better than their teachers.”

The amusing irony in this poem, one of a series of Lucillian epigrams on stealing statues of gods (AP 11.174-7), is not only that Hermes has failed in his duties as γυμνασίων ἐπίσκοπος, but that he, a god of thieves, has himself been stolen. Martial too was fond of mocking the sticky-fingered; in fact some of his most memorable poems involve the theft of items (especially napkins, after Catullus 12) from dinner parties.⁴⁶⁹ The theme of divine larceny, however, was also in his repertoire, as the following example, quite similar to that of Lucilius, demonstrates (Ep. 6.72):

fur notae nimium rapacitatis
conpile Cilix volebat hortum,
ingenti sed erat, Fabulle, in horto
praeter marmoreum nihil Priapum.
dum non vult vacua manu redire,
ipsum subripuit Cilix Priapum.

⁴⁶⁹ Ep. 8.59 and 12.28. The latter is most clearly influenced by Catullus.

Cilix, an infamously greedy thief, wanted to pillage a garden, but in that massive garden, Fabullus, there was nothing but a marble Priapus. He didn't want to return empty-handed, so Cilix stole Priapus himself.

As with the Lucillian poem, here the god's statue, ironically intended to protect the garden from thieves, has been stolen. Likewise, both Lucilius and Martial develop the character of their subject (to the extent that this is possible in a brief epigram) by articulating his thoughts – Aulus justifies his theft of Hermes by claiming that the student has surpassed the master, while Cilix's decision is explained by the absence of anything else to steal and a desire not to leave empty-handed.⁴⁷⁰ There is, however, an important distinction that should be pointed out: the identity of the god in question. Lucilius' thief steals a statue of Hermes, whose occasionally rapacious reputation, as explained above, sharpens the humor of the poem. Martial's thief, on the other hand, steals a statue of Priapus, who, while certainly a frequent protector of gardens, also has a more wanton reputation.⁴⁷¹ The change of god is striking, and we might question the motivation behind Martial's choice of an obscene (and comic) god over Lucilius' more traditional Olympian god. The decision, I would argue, once again reflects Martial's desire to corrupt or debase his Lucillian model. As always, this is not necessarily malicious, but rather plays a game with the reader, who is expected first to recognize the allusion to Lucilius and then to realize that Martial has made a ridiculous substitution: the ithyphallic Priapus for the more dignified Hermes. The effect is simultaneously degrading and elevating, as Martial implicitly asserts his superiority to Lucilius, albeit in the dubious realm of obscenity.

⁴⁷⁰ Cf. also *Ep.* 8.59.13-14. Watson and Watson (2003) ad loc.

⁴⁷¹ Watson and Watson (2003: ad loc.) argue that *ingenti... horto* is a surprise expression intended to allude to the aforementioned reputation. In poems about Priapus, *ingens* typically refers to the god's phallus.

The final poems to be discussed here address two of Martial's least favorite qualities rolled into one: being a poor poet (some examples of which we saw at the beginning of this chapter) and being a poor host.⁴⁷² The Greek epigram in question is attributed to Lucillius (*AP* 11.394):

Ποιητὴς πανάριστος ἀληθῶς ἐστὶν ἐκεῖνος,
ὅστις δειπνίζει τοὺς ἀκροασαμένους.
ἦν δ' ἀναγνώσκη καὶ νήστιας οἴκαδε πέμπη,
εἰς αὐτὸν τρεπέτω τὴν ἰδίαν μανίην.

He is truly the best of all poets who feeds his listeners. But if he recites and sends them home hungry, let him turn his own lunacy upon himself.

While the poem's overall point is clear, the precise meaning of its punchline is somewhat obscure. Burnikel suggests two alternatives, both of which are probably in play here: (1) the poet should vent his enthusiasm to himself, i.e. alone; or (2) the poet, much like Ajax, should turn his madness against himself, i.e. starve. He also suggests a potentially metapoetic reading for the epigram, whereby the poet is likened to a dinner host, but in reality is not: under such a reading, Lucillius asserts that a good poet must (metaphorically) provide a feast for the ears of his listeners, or else suffer the consequences for his failure to do so.⁴⁷³ Martial seems to have had Lucillius' poem in mind when he took on the same subject in his third book (*Ep.* 3.50):

haec tibi, non alia, est ad cenam causa vocandi,
versiculos recites ut, Ligurine, tuos.
deposui soleas, adfertur protinus ingens
inter lactucas oxygarumque liber:
alter perlegitur, dum fercula prima morantur:
tertius est, nec adhuc mensa secunda venit:
et quartum recitas et quintum denique librum.
putidus est, totiens si mihi ponis aprum.
quod si non scombris scelerata poemata donas,
cenabis solus iam, Ligurine, domi.

⁴⁷² Martial on bad poets (e.g.): 3.44; 5.53 (on which see above); 7.4; 10.3, 76; 12.47, 61, 63. Martial on bad hosts (e.g.): 1.20, 43; 3.12, 13, 49, 60, 94; 4.68; 6.11; 12.27.

⁴⁷³ Burnikel (1980) 27.

This and this alone is your reason for inviting me to dinner, Ligurinus: so that you can recite your verses. The moment I remove my shoes, you have them bring out, amidst the salads and dressing, a huge book. Then another is read all the way through, while the first course is nowhere to be found. Then a third one, and still no dessert. Then you recite a fourth and (finally) a fifth book. Boar that's served to me this often is nauseating. So unless you hand over your accursed poems to the mackerels, Ligurinus, soon you'll be hosting dinner parties by yourself.

This poem, the third in a sequence (along with 3.44 and 45) targeting the terrible dinners of a certain Ligurinus, effectively adapts and expands upon the theme from Lucillius' epigram while still making occasional reference to its Greek model. The structure of the Lucillian poem is bipartite: the first couplet describes the ideal poet/host and the last threatens the less-than-ideal one. But as Fusi observes, Martial's structure is *tripartite*, consisting of an opening couplet which makes a starting assumption (Ligurinus has ulterior motives for his dinner invitations), the central three couplets which provide concrete evidence for this assumption, and a final couplet which makes a concluding threat ("give up the poetry or dine alone").⁴⁷⁴ Based on this division, it seems clear that Martial has amplified Lucillius' dual structure by inserting six lines of specific details between the first and last couplets. The framing distiches are themselves reminiscent of the Greek poem, especially the last, in which both authors use conditions ($\eta\nu$ / *si*) to threaten their respective poet-hosts with negative consequences, especially solitude, although as mentioned above the sense of Lucillius' punchline is ambiguous. Indeed, an important change that Martial has made is the omission of this very ambiguity: from the outset, the reader is made aware of a specific named target, a poet who (explicitly) invites his listeners to dinner. The same details which make Martial's epigram longer than Lucillius' likewise contribute to its specificity, as we are given a catalog of books read and courses served (or rather not served). Moreover, the poem concludes with a direct

⁴⁷⁴ Fusi (2006) 353-4.

threat (*cenabis solus iam, Ligurine, domi*) of the sort that can only be inferred from Lucillius' puzzling conclusion (εἰς αὐτὸν τρεπέτω τὴν ἰδίαν μανίην).

By transforming his intentionally enigmatic Greek model, a generalized commentary on poets as hosts (whether literal or metaphorical), into a concrete attack on a named individual who happens to embody the very qualities criticized by Lucillius, Martial is as usual taking an ambivalent stance toward the work of his predecessor. On the one hand, his poem echoes and supports Lucillius' claims: Ligurinus is a prized example of the kind of poet Lucillius mocks in his epigram, and indeed, Martial agrees, he is deserving of an ironic punishment. On the other hand, Martial quietly trumps Lucillius by more than doubling the length of the original poem and by concretizing it to such an extent as to call attention to his model's flagrant lack of detail, which he might be portraying as a flaw. Likewise, Martial muffles the allusion to Lucillius with a more obvious allusion to his oft-touted Roman predecessor, Catullus: the protasis of the last couplet (*si non scombris scelerata poemata donas...*) invokes Catullus 95, which includes a jab at the infamous *cacata carta* of Volusius (*Volusi annales Paduam morientur ad ipsam / et laxas scombris saepe dabunt tunicas*, "but the annals of Volusius will perish by the Padua itself, and will frequently provide loose wrapping for mackerels," 7-8). This reference effectively serves as a distraction from the primary Greek model for Martial's poem, but the more well-read readers will recognize it for what it is: a tongue-in-cheek nose-thumbing at the Greek epigrammatic tradition.

V. Conclusion

The goal of this chapter has been twofold. First, I have provided as systematic an

overview as possible of the ways in which Martial appropriates the themes of Greek skoptic epigram, as represented by Lucillius and Nicarchus. His allusions to specific poems by these authors are more frequent and more apparent than practically any other Greek poet, which has given us some rare and valuable opportunities for direct comparison. Second, I have attempted to demonstrate how Martial's intentionally ambivalent relationship with his Greek epigrammatic predecessors, which we have explored in previous chapters using poems from the classical and Hellenistic periods, continues unabated right up to his near-contemporaries in the imperial period.

Although it is difficult to make generalizations about the author of such a multifarious array of poems, who interacts with an equally diverse selection of Greek models, and who so determinedly contradicts himself on so many occasions, this chapter's collection of readings has nevertheless afforded us the ability to make a few broad remarks about how Martial approaches the short tradition of Greek skoptic epigram. Throughout the *Epigrams*, his debt to Lucillius and (to a lesser extent) Nicarchus is unspoken but apparent. Martial directly imitates several poems by these authors, and even when he alludes to them only in passing, he assumes that some portion of his audience will be familiar with the skoptic lineage within which he is placing himself. At times, this assumption is part of a learned game with the reader, but just as often, Martial seems to be jockeying for position with Lucillius and Nicarchus by making implicit claims to superiority over them, taking potshots at various aspects of specific poems, or debasing their work. Whether or not Martial was truly threatened by the reputation of the imperial Greek epigrammatists, his subversion and transformation of their themes reflects his engagement in a lighthearted rivalry with them. Needless to say,

since the rules of this rivalry are dictated by Martial himself, he is bound to come out on top.

CONCLUSION

The goal of this dissertation has been to shine some much-needed light on one of the most shadowy aspects of Martial's *Epigrams*, namely how it relates to the Greek epigrammatic tradition. Such shadows are no accident: they result from a deliberate choice by Martial to place himself as often as possible atop a towering tradition of Latin epigram, and in the process to suppress all mention of the Greek tradition. I have argued, however, that this suppression is neither an act of malice on Martial's part nor an attempt to ignore the existence of Greek epigram. Rather, Martial encourages his audience to peer into the shadows and to find there the hidden side of the *Epigrams*: an intricate web of allusions to Greek epigrammatic *topoi*, themes, and authors. The attentive reader will discover a Martial seemingly pulled in two directions, toward a respect for the Greek poets who contributed to the development of his genre, but also toward a desire to assert his superiority – and that of Roman poets more generally – to them. That said, Martial probably did not lose any sleep over these two contradictory impulses. If anything, he revelled in the ambiguity that they produced, as it provided him with countless opportunities to play a learned game with his readers, whether by covertly alluding to Greek originals, by distorting or transforming common Greek themes, or by 'capping' one (or several) of his Greek predecessors.⁴⁷⁵ Needless to say, if in the course of entertaining his audience in such a way Martial happened to make himself look better at the expense of the Greek epigrammatists, he would surely have been able to live with that consequence.

⁴⁷⁵ On the phenomenon of 'capping' and its prevalence in Greek poetry, see Collins (2005).

But now that Martial's engagement with the Greek epigrammatic tradition has been brought into the light, where do we go from here? The potential avenues for future scholarship are many in number. This study has provided a sizable overview of how Martial interacts with various subgenres and authors of Greek epigram, but spatial constraints have necessarily limited the scope of my arguments, and any one of the topics I have discussed might be explored in even greater depth. Especially promising, in my opinion, is the prospect of comparing Martial's work with that of individual poets from the Greek Anthology, who have only recently come into their own as distinct entities worthy of focused scholarly attention. I have made some opening forays into how Martial relates to authors like Asclepiades, Posidippus, Callimachus, and Meleager, but any one of these relationships would reward further study, not to mention Martial's engagement with other Greek epigrammatists whom I was unable to treat so systematically, if at all, such as Leonidas of Tarentum, Anyte, Crinagoras, or Antipater of Sidon. Scholars might also turn to the presence in Martial's *Epigrams* of other Greek authors. I have touched upon his comic appropriation of Homer, but also worth consideration are the Greek comedians and the authors of lyric, elegy, and other kinds of sympotic poetry. Those without a Martialian bent, meanwhile, might consider the role played by Greek epigram in other Latin genres. As I mentioned in my introduction, recent work has been done on Hellenistic epigram and Roman love elegy, but it is very much worth exploring its role in practically any other poetic genre as well, given its ready accessibility to Roman authors thanks to the *Garlands* of Meleager and Philip. In short, then, the possibilities for further scholarship are nearly endless, and I am hopeful that what I have started here will give rise to new ideas about Martial and the Greek

epigrammatists.

It is fitting, I believe, to conclude as I began, with the words of Martial himself. The following epigram, the final poem of Book 4, pits the poet's uncontrollable desire to write against the physical constraints of an epigram book. The accomplishment (or non-accomplishment, as the case may be) that Martial here claims for himself is a far cry from Meleager's triumphant colophon to the *Garland* (*AP* 12.257.3-4: τὸν ἐκ πάντων ἠθροισμένον εἰς ἓνα μόχθον / ὕμνοθετᾶν βύβλω τᾷδ' ἐνελιζάμενον, "...he who has accomplished the task of collecting in this book the work of all poets rolled into a single labor..."). Instead we encounter the self-effacement that any reader of the *Epigrams* will by now have come to expect (*Ep.* 4.89):

Ohe, iam satis est, ohe, libelle,
iam pervenimus usque ad umbilicos.
tu procedere adhuc et ire quaeris,
nec summa potes in schida teneri,
sic tamquam tibi res peracta non sit,
quae prima quoque pagina peracta est.
iam lector queriturque deficitque,
iam librarius hoc et ipse dicit
'ohe, iam satis est, ohe, libelle.'

Whoa there, little book, that's enough now. Whoa! We've already made it right up to the binding, and you're still trying to advance onward – no sheet can hold you, as if you weren't finished with the business that was in reality finished on the very first page. The reader is complaining now and on the point of passing out; even the copyist is saying it: "Whoa there, little book, that's enough now. Whoa!"

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Modern commentaries on Martial:

All:

Friedländer, L. (1886) *M. Valerii Martialis epigrammaton libri*. Leipzig.

***Liber Spectaculorum*:**

Coleman, K. (2006) *M. Valerii Martialis Liber Spectaculorum*. Oxford.

Book I:

Citroni, M. (1975) *M. Valerii Martialis Epigrammaton Liber Primus*. Florence.

Howell, P. (1980) *A Commentary on Book One of the Epigrams of Martial*. London.

Book II:

Williams, C.A. (2004) *Martial Epigrams Book 2. A Commentary*. Oxford.

Book III:

Fusi, A. (2006) *M. Valerii Martialis Epigrammaton Liber Tertius*. Hildesheim.

Book IV:

Moreno Soldevila, R. (2006) *Martial, Book IV: A Commentary*. Leiden.

Book V:

Howell, P. (1995) *Martial Epigrams V*. Warminster.

Book VI:

Grewing, F. (1996) *Martial Buch VI. Ein Kommentar*. Göttingen.

Book VII:

Galán Vioque, G. (2002) *Martial, Book VII. A Commentary*. trans. J. J. Zoltowski.
Leiden, Boston and Cologne.

Book VIII:

Schöffel, C. (2002) *Martial, Buch 8. Einleitung, Text, Übersetzung, Kommentar*. Stuttgart.

Book IX:

Henriksen, C. (2012) *A Commentary on Martial Epigrams Book 9*. Oxford.

Book X:

Damschen, G. and A. Heil (eds.) (2004) *Marcus Valerius Martialis. Epigrammaton liber decimus. Das zehnte Epigrammbuch*. Frankfurt am Main.

Book XI:

Kay, N. M. (1985) *Martial Book XI*. London.

Book XII:

Bowie, M.N.R. (1988) "Martial, Book XII: A Commentary." Diss. Oxford.

Book XIII:

Leary, T. L. (2001) *The Xenia. Martial Book 13*. London.

Book XIV:

Leary, T. L. (1996) *The Apophoreta. Martial Book 14*. London.

Selected poems:

Watson, L. and Watson, P. A. (2003) *Martial. Select Epigrams*. Cambridge.

General Bibliography:

- Adams, J.N. (1982) *The Roman Sexual Vocabulary*. London.
- (2003) *Bilingualism and the Latin Language*. Cambridge.
- Angiò, F. (2003) “Posidippo di Pella, Ep. IX, 3086-3093 Gow-Page (Anth. Pal. XII 168)” *MH* 60: 6-21.
- Argentieri, L. (2007) “Meleager and Philip as epigram collectors” in Bing and Bruss (eds.) (2007) 147-64.
- Augoustakis, A. (ed.) (2014) *Flavian Literature and its Greek Past*. Urbana-Champaign, IL.
- Austin C. and G. Bastianini G. (eds.) (2002) *Posidippi Pellaei quae supersunt omnia*. Milan.
- Baraz, Y. (2012) *A Written Republic: Cicero’s Philosophical Politics*. Princeton, NJ.
- Bastianini, G. and C. Gallazzi C. (eds.) (2001) *Papiri dell’Università di Milano: Posidippo di Pella. Epigrammi*. Milan.
- Baumbach, M., A. Petrovic, and I. Petrovic (eds.) (2010) *Archaic and Classical Greek Epigram*. Cambridge.
- Beckelhymer, S.D. (2014) “The way that our Catullus walked: grammar and poetry in the late Republic.” Diss. UPenn.
- Bessone, F. (2014) “Polis, court, empire: Greek culture, Roman society, and the system of genres in Statius’ poetry” in Augoustakis (ed.) (2014) 215-34.
- Best, E. E. (1969) “Martial’s readers in the Roman world” *CJ* 64:208-12.
- Bettenworth, A. (2007) “The mutual influence of inscribed and literary epigram” in Bing and Bruss (eds.) (2007) 69-94.
- Bing, P. and J.S. Bruss (eds.) (2007) *Brill’s Companion to Hellenistic Epigram*. Leiden and Boston.
- Bishop, C. (2011) “Greek scholarship and interpretation in the works of Cicero.” Diss. UPenn.
- Blake, S.H. (2008) “Writing Materials: Things in the Literature of Flavian Rome.” Diss. University of Southern California.
- Blomqvist, J. (1998) “The development of the satirical epigram in the Hellenistic period” in M.A. Harder, R.F. Regtuit, and G.C. Wakker (eds.) *Genre in Hellenistic Poetry*. Groningen: 45-60.
- Bloom, H. (1973) *The Anxiety of Influence*. Oxford.
- Booth, J. and R. Maltby (2006) *What’s in a Name?: The Significance of Proper Names in Latin Literature*. Swansea, Wales.
- Bowie, E. (2007) “From archaic elegy to Hellenistic sympotic epigram?” in Bing and Bruss (eds.) (2007) 95-112.
- (2010) “Epigram as narration” in Baumbach et al. (eds.) (2010) 313-84.
- Boyer, B.B. (1921) “The influence of Hellenistic epigram upon Catullus and his contemporaries” Diss. University of Chicago.
- Boyle, A.J. and W.J. Dominik (eds.) (2003) *Flavian Rome. Culture, Image, Text*. Leiden and Boston.
- Bremmer, J.N. (1987) “The old women of ancient Greece” in J. Blok and P. Mason (eds.)

- Sexual Asymmetry: Studies in Ancient Society*. Amsterdam: 191-215.
- Brown, R.D. (1987) *Lucretius on Love and Sex*. New York.
- Bruss, J.S. (2005) *Hidden Presences. Monuments, Gravesites, and Corpses in Greek Funerary Epigram*. Leuven.
- Buchheit, V. (1964) "Amor caecus" *CM* 25: 129-3.
- Burnikel, W. (1980) *Untersuchungen zur Struktur des Witzepigramms bei Lukillios und Martial*. Wiesbaden.
- Cavalca, M.G. (2001) *Il grecismi nel Satyricon di Petronio*. Bologna.
- Cameron, A. (1993) *The Greek Anthology from Meleager to Planudes*. Oxford.
- (1995) *Callimachus and his Critics*. Princeton.
- Canobbio, A. (2011) "Parole greche in Marziale: tipologie di utilizzo e tre problemi filologici (3,20,5; 3,77,19; 9,44,6)" in A. Bonadeo, A. Canobbio, and F. Gasti (eds.) (2011) *Filellenismo e identità romana in età flavia: Atti della VIII Giornata ghisleriana di Filologia classica (Pavia, 10-11 novembre 2009.)* Como-Pavia: 59-89.
- Casson, L. (1995) *Ships and Seamanship in the Ancient World*. Baltimore.
- Ceccaroli, S. (2011) "Studi sull'epigramma scoptico greco" Diss. Univ. di Bologna.
- Chahoud, A. (2004) "The Roman satirist speaks Greek" *Classics Ireland* 11: 1-46.
- Charpin, F. (1978) "La notion de solécisme chez les grammairiens latins" in J. Collart (ed.) *Varron, Grammaire antique et Stylistique latine*. Paris: 211-6.
- Citroni, M. (2003) "Marziale, Plinio il giovane e il problema dell'identità di genere dell'epigramma latino" in F. Bertini (ed.) *III Giornate Filologiche 'Francesco Della Corte'*. Genoa (2003) 7-29.
- Clack, J. (1999) *Asclepiades of Samos and Leonidas of Tarentum: The Poems*. Wauconda, IL.
- Clarke, W.M. (1981) "Achelous in Anthologia Palatina 12. 51 (Callimachus)" *CP* 76: 297-300.
- Conca, F. (2004/5) "Su alcuni epigrammi scoptici [u.a. *AP* 11,17; 96; 124; 170]" *Rend. Acc. Arch. Lett. e Belle Arti* 73: 323-34.
- Coleman, K. (1990) "Fatal charades: Roman executions staged as mythological enactments" *JRS* 80: 44-73.
- Collins, D. (2005) *Master of the Game: Competition and Performance in Greek Poetry*. Cambridge, MA.
- Conte, G.B. (1994) *Latin Literature: A History*. Baltimore.
- D'Arms, J. (1990) "The Roman *convivium* and the idea of equality" in O. Murray (ed.) (1990) *Symptica*. Oxford: 308-20.
- Darwall-Smith, R.H. (1996) *Emperors and Architecture: A Study of Flavian Rome*. Brussels.
- Davis, P. J. (2009) "Remembering Ovid: The Io episode in Valerius Flaccus' *Argonautica*" *Antichthon* 43: 1-11.
- Day, J.W. (1989) "Rituals in stone: Early Greek grave epigrams and monuments" *JHS* 109: 16-28.
- (1994) "Interactive offerings: early Greek dedicatory epigrams and ritual" *HSPH* 96: 37-74.
- (2007) "Poems on stone: the inscribed antecedents of Hellenistic epigram" in Bing and

- Bruss (eds.) (2007) 29-48.
- (2010) *Archaic Greek Epigram and Dedication: Representation and Reperformance*. Cambridge.
- Deane, S.N. (1918) "Greek in Pliny's Letters" *CW* 12: 41-4.
- Defreyne, L. (1993) "Erotes and Eros in the Epigrams of Asclepiades." *Aevum(ant)* 6: 199-236.
- De Quesnay, I. and T. Woodman (eds.) (2012) *Catullus: Poems, Books, Readers*. Cambridge.
- Dinter, M. (2005) "Epic and epigram: Minor heroes in Virgil's *Aeneid*" *CQ* 55: 1-17.
- (2009) "Epic from epigram: The poetics of Valerius Flaccus' *Argonautica*" *AJPh* 130: 533-66.
- Edmunds, L. (2002) "Mars as Hellenistic lover: *De rerum natura* 1.29-40 and its subtexts" *IJCT* 8: 343-58.
- Edwards, C. and G. Woolf (2003) *Rome the Cosmopolis*. Cambridge.
- Edwards, C. (2003) "Incorporating the alien: The art of conquest" in Edwards and Woolf (2003).
- Elomaa, H. (2015) "The poetics of the *Carmina Priapea*." Diss. UPenn.
- Fain, G. (2008) *Writing Epigrams: The Art of Composition in Catullus, Callimachus and Martial*. Brussels.
- (2010) *Ancient Greek Epigrams: Major Poets in Verse Translation*. Berkeley.
- Fantham, E. (2011) *Roman Readings: Roman Response to Greek literature from Plautus to Statius and Quintilian*. New York.
- Farrell, J. (2001) *Latin Language and Latin Culture from Ancient to Modern Times*. Cambridge.
- (2004) "Roman Homer." in R. Fowler (ed.) (2004) *The Cambridge Companion to Homer*. Cambridge: 254-271.
- Finkmann, S. (2014) "Collective speech and silence in the *Argonautica* of Apollonius and Valerius" in Augoustakis (ed.) (2014) 73-94.
- Fitzgerald, W. (2007) *Martial: The World of the Epigram*. Chicago.
- Fowler, D. (1995) "Martial and the Book" *Ramus* 24: 31-58.
- Fraenkel, E. (2007) *Plautine Elements in Plautus (Plautinisches im Plautus)* (trr. T. Drevikovsky and F. Muecke) Oxford.
- Fucecchi, M. (2003) "Il plurilinguismo della Menippea latina: appunti su Varrone satirico e l'Apocolocyntosis di Seneca" in R. Oniga (ed.) (2003) *Il plurilinguismo nella tradizione letteraria latina*. Rome: 91-130.
- (2014) "The philosophy of power: Greek literary tradition and Silius' *On Kingship*" in Augoustakis (ed.) (2014) 305-26.
- Galan Vioque, G. (2002) "La astrologia y los astrologos en la *Anthologia Palatina*: Alusiones y parodias" *MHNH* 2: 221-36.
- Gardner-Chloros, P. (2009) *Code-switching*. Cambridge.
- Garrison, D.H. (1978) *Mild Frenzy: A Reading of the Hellenistic Love Epigram*. Wiesbaden.
- Garthwaite, J. (1990) "Martial, Book 6, on Domitian's moral censorship" *Prudentia* 22: 13-22.
- (2009) "'Ludimus innocui': Interpreting Martial's imperial epigrams" in *Writing*

- Politics in Imperial Rome*, W.J. Dominik, J. Garthwaite, and P.A. Roche (eds.). Leiden (2009) 405-427.
- Gibson, B. (2013) "Hymnic features in Statian epic and the *Silvae*" in A. Augoustakis (ed.) (2013). *Ritual and Religion in Flavian Epic*. Oxford: 127-44.
- Giegengack, J.M. (1969) "Significant Names in Martial" Diss. Yale.
- Glucker, J. and C. Burnett (eds.) (2012) *Greek into Latin from Antiquity until the Nineteenth Century*. London.
- Goldhill, S. (2007) "What is ekphrasis for?" *CP* 102: 1-19.
- Gow, A. S. F. and D.L. Page (eds.) (1965) *The Greek Anthology. Hellenistic Epigram*, 2 vols. Cambridge.
- (1968) *The Greek Anthology. The Garland of Philip*. 2 vols. Cambridge.
- Gowers, E. (1994) "Persius and the decoction of Nero" in J. Elsner and J. Masters (eds.) (1994) *Reflections of Nero: Culture, History, and Representation*. Chapel Hill.
- Greene, E. (2000) "Playing with Tradition: Gender and Innovation in the Epigrams of Anyte" *Helios* 27: 15-32.
- Grewing, F. (1996) "Möglichkeiten und Grenzen des Vergleichs: Martials *Diadumenos* und Catulls *Lesbia*" *Hermes* 124: 333-54.
- (ed.) (1998) *Toto notus in orbe. Perspektiven der Martial-Interpretation*. Stuttgart.
- Guglielmino, F. (1931) *Epigrammi satirici del libro XI^o dell'Anthologia*. Catania.
- Guichard, L.A. (2004) *Asclepiades de Samos: Epigramas y fragmentos*. Bern.
- Gutzwiller, K.J. (1998) *Poetic Garlands. Hellenistic Epigram in Context*. Berkeley.
- (2005) *The New Posidippus. A Hellenistic Poetry Book*. Oxford.
- (2006) "Learning and love in the epigrams of Meleager" in S. Eklund (ed.) *Συγγράμματα: Studies in Honour of Jan Fredrik Kindstrand*. Uppsala (2006) 67-85.
- (2007) "The paradox of amatory epigram" in Bing and Bruss (eds.) (2007) 313-32.
- (2012) "Catullus and the *Garland of Meleager*" in De Quesnay and Woodman (eds.) (2012) 79-111.
- Harder, A. (2007) "Epigram and the heritage of epic" in Bing and Bruss (eds.) (2007) 409-28.
- Harder, A., R.F. Regtuit, and G.C. Wakker (eds.) (1998) *Genre in Hellenistic Poetry*. Groningen.
- Harlow, M. and R. Laurence (2011) "Viewing the old: Recording and respecting the elderly at Rome and in the empire" in C. Krötzel and K. Mustakallio (eds.) *On Old Age: Approaching Death in Antiquity and the Middle Ages*. Turnhout: 3-23.
- Hennig, J.-L. (2003) *Martial*. Paris.
- Henriksen, C. (1998) "Martial und Statius" in Grewing (ed.) (1998) 77-118.
- (2006) "Martial's modes of mourning. Sepulchral epitaphs in the Epigrams" in Nauta et al. (eds.) (2006) 249-367.
- Henry, R.M. (1948) "On Martial IX. 44" *Hermathena* 71: 93-4.
- Hinds, S. (1997) "Do-it-yourself literary tradition: Statius, Martial and others" *MD* 39: 187-207.
- (1998) *Allusion and Intertext. Dynamics of Appropriation in Roman Poetry*. Cambridge.
- (2007) "Martial's Ovid / Ovid's Martial", in *JRS* 97: 113-54.
- Holzberg, N. (2002) *Martial und das antike Epigramm*. Darmstadt.

- . (2006) "Onomato-poetics: a linear reading of Martial" in Booth and Maltby, eds. (2006): 145-58.
- Horsfall, N. (1983) "Some problems in the 'laudatio Turiae'" *BICS* 30: 85-98.
- Hörschele, R. (2010) *Die blütenlesende Muse: Poetik und Textualität antiker Epigrammsammlungen*. Tübingen.
- Hough, J.N. (1934) "The use of Greek words by Plautus" *AJPh* 55: 346-64.
- Hulls, J.-M. (2014) "Greek author, Greek past: Statius, Athens, and the tragic self" in Augoustakis (ed.) (2014) 193-214.
- Hunter, R. (2006) *The Shadow of Callimachus: Studies in the Reception of Hellenistic Poetry at Rome*. Cambridge
- (2010) "Language and interpretation in Greek epigram" in Baumbach et al. (eds.) (2010) 265-88.
- Hutchinson, G.O. (2003) "The Catullan corpus, Greek epigram, and the poetry of objects" *CQ* 53: 206-221.
- Jay, P. (ed.) (1973) *The Greek Anthology and Other Ancient Greek Epigrams*. New York.
- Joepgen, U. (1967) "Wortspiele bei Martial" Diss. Bonn.
- Johnson, W. R. (2005) "Small wonders: The poetics of Martial, Book Fourteen" in W. Batstone and G. Tissol (eds.) *Defining Genre and Gender in Latin Literature*, New York (2005) 139-50.
- Juhnke, H. (1972) *Homerisches in römischer Epik flavischer Zeit : Untersuchung zu Szenennachbildungen und Strukturentsprechungen in Statius' Thebais und Achilleis und in Silius' Punica*. München.
- Kaimo, J. (1979) *The Romans and the Greek Language*. Helsinki.
- Karakasis, E. (2014) "Homeric receptions in Flavian epic: Intertextual characterization in *Punica* 7" in Augoustakis (ed.) (2014) 251-66.
- Keith, A. (ed.) (2011) *Latin Elegy and Hellenistic Epigram: A Tale of Two Genres at Rome*. Cambridge.
- Kenney, E.J. (1970) "Doctus Lucretius" *Mnemosyne* 23: 380-88.
- Kim, L. (2010) *Homer between History and Fiction in Imperial Greek Literature*. Cambridge.
- Knox, P. E. (1985) "Wine, water and Callimachean poetics" *HSCP* 89: 107-19.
- (2006) "An unnoticed imitation of Callimachus, *Aetia* fr. 1.1 Pf." *CQ* 56: 639-640.
- (2010) "Catullus and Callimachus" in M. Skinner (ed.) (2010): 152-171.
- Köhnken, A. (2007) "Epinician epigram" in Bing and Bruss (eds.) (2007) 295-312.
- Konstan, D. (2013) "'Can't buy me love': The economy of gifts in amorous relations" in M.L. Satlow (ed.) *The Gift in Antiquity. The ancient world: comparative histories*. Oxford: 96-106.
- Krasne, D. (2014) "When the Argo met the Argo: Poetic destruction in Valerius' *Argonautica*" in Augoustakis (ed.) (2014) 33-48.
- Lattimore, R. (1962) *Themes in Greek and Latin Epitaphs*. Urbana, IL.
- Laurens, P. (1965) "Martial et l'épigramme grecque du 1er siècle ap. J.-C." *Revue des Etudes Latines* 43: 315-41.
- Leigh, M. (2010) "Boxing and sacrifice: Apollonius, Vergil, and Valerius" *HSCP* 105: 117-55.
- Lindsay, W. M. (1903) *M. Val. Martialis Epigrammata*. Oxford.

- Littlewood, R.J. (2014) "Loyalty and the lyre: Constructions of *fides* in Hannibal's Capuan banquets" in Augoustakis (ed.) (2014) 267-86.
- Livingstone, N. and G. Nisbet (2010) *Epigram*. Cambridge,
- Longo, V. (1967) *L'epigramma scoptico greco: Pubbl. dell'Ist. di Filologia Classica dell'Universita di Genova* 24. Genova.
- Lorenz, S. (2002) *Erotik und Panegyric. Martials epigrammatische Kaiser*. Classica Monacensia 23, Tübingen.
- (2003) "Martial, Herkules und Domitian: Büsten, Statuetten und Statuen im *Epigrammaton Liber Nonus*." *Mnemosyne* 56: 566-84.
- (2004) "Waterscape with black and white: epigrams, cycles and webs in Martial's *Epigrammaton liber quartus*" *AJP* 125: 255-78.
- (2009) "Der «ernste» Martial: Tod und Trauer in den Epigrammen." *Gymnasium* 116: 359-380.
- (2010) "Catullus and Martial", in M.B. Skinner (ed.), *A Companion to Catullus*. Malden, MA: 418-38.
- Louden, B. (1995) "Categories of Homeric wordplay" in *TAPA* 125: 27-46.
- Luppe, W. (2002) "Nikarchos-Epigramme" *Gnomon* 74: 486.
- Magnelli, E. (2005) "Nicarco, AP 11.328: allusioni oscene e allusioni erudite (con osservazioni sulla trasmissione degli epigrammi scoptici)" *SemRom* 8: 153-66.
- Maltby, R. (2006) "Proper names as a linking device in Martial" in Booth and Maltby, eds. (2006): 159-67.
- Marinis, A. (2015) "Statius' *Thebaid* and Greek tragedy: The legacy of Thebes" in W.J. Dominik, C. Newlands, and K. Gervais (eds.) (2015) *Brill's Companion to Statius*. Boston: 343-61.
- Mindt, N. (2013) *Martials 'epigrammatischer Kanon'*. München.
- Montes Cala, J.G. (1999) "Sobre la naturaleza de la poesía en el simposio: AP V 134 (Posidipo)" *ExcPhil* 9: 101-9.
- Nadeau, Y. (1984) "Catullus' sparrow, Martial, Juvenal and Ovid" *Latomus* 43: 861-8.
- Nagy, G. (2004) "Homeric echoes in Posidippus" in B. Acosta-Hughes, E. Kosmetatou, and M. Baumbach (eds.) *Labored in Papyrus Leaves: Perspectives on an Epigram Collection Attributed to Posidippus (P.Mil.Vogl. VIII 309)*. Cambridge, MA (2004) 57-64.
- Nauta, R.R., H.-J. Van Dam, and J.J.L. Smolenaars (eds.) (2006) *Flavian Poetry*. Leiden and Boston.
- Nelis, D. (2012) "Callimachus in Verona: Catullus and Alexandrian poetry" in De Quesnay and Woodman (eds.) (2012) 1-28.
- Neger, M. (2014) "'Graece numquid' ait 'poeta nescis?' Martial and the Greek epigrammatic tradition" in Augoustakis (ed.): 327-44.
- Newmyer, S. (1984) "The triumph of art over nature. Martial and Statius on Flavian aesthetics" *Helios* 11(1): 1-7.
- Nisbet, G. (2003) *Greek Epigram in the Roman Empire: Martial's Forgotten Rivals*. Oxford.

- (2006) “‘That’s not funny’: Advice in skoptic epigram” in D. Spencer and E. Theodorakopoulos (eds.) *Advice and its Rhetoric in Greece and Rome*. Bari: 159-77.
- (2007a) “Satiric epigram” in Bing and Bruss (eds.) (2007) 353-69.
- (2007b) “Roman imperial receptions of Hellenistic epigram” in Bing and Bruss (eds.) (2007) 543-64.
- Nystrom, B. (2004) *An English Translation of the Poetry of Lucillius, a First-Century Greek Epigrammatist*. Lewiston, NY.
- O’Connor, E. (1998) “Martial the moral jester: Priapic motifs and the restoration of order in the *Epigrams*: in Grewing (ed.) (1998) 187-204.
- Paton, W.R. (1918) *The Greek Anthology*. 5 vols. Cambridge, MA.
- Petrovic, A. (2007) “Inscribed epigram in pre-Hellenistic literary sources” in Bing and Bruss (eds.) (2007) 49-68.
- Pitcher, R.A. (1998) “Martial’s debt to Ovid”, in Grewing (ed.) (1998) 59-76.
- Possanza, D.M. (2004) *Translating the Heavens: Aratus, Germanicus, and the Poetics of Latin Translation*. New York.
- Prinz, K. (1911) *Martial und die griechische Epigrammatik*. Vienna and Leipzig.
- Prior, R.E. (1996) “Going around hungry: Topography and poetics in Martial 2.14” *AJPh* 117: 121-41.
- Puelma, M. (1996) “Επίγραμμα–epigramma: Aspekte einer Wortgeschichte.” *Museum Helveticum* 53: 123-39.
- Reitzenstein, R. (1893) *Epigramm und Skolion*. Geissen.
- (1907) “Epigramm.” *RE* 6: 70-111.
- Ribbeck, O. (1871) *Tragicorum Romanorum Fragmenta*. Leipzig.
- Richlin, A. (1992) *The Garden of Priapus. Sexuality and Aggression in Roman Humour*. Oxford and New York.
- (1992) “Sulpicia the satirist” in *CW* 86: 125-40.
- Rimell, V. (2009) *Martial’s Rome: Empire and the Ideology of Epigram*. Cambridge.
- Ripoll, F. (2001) “Le monde homérique dans les *Punica* de Silius Italicus” *Latomus* 60: 87-107.
- Robert, L. (1968) “Les épigrammes satiriques de Lucillius sur les athlètes: parodie et réalités.” in A. Dihle, (ed.) *L’Épigramme Grecque*. Vandoeuvres-Geneva (1968) 179-295.
- Roman, L. (2001) “The representation of literary materiality in Martial’s Epigrams” *JRS* 91: 113-45.
- Rosen, R. (2007a) *Making Mockery: The Poetics of Ancient Satire*. Oxford.
- (2007b) “The Hellenistic epigrams on Archilochus and Hipponax” in Bing and Bruss (eds.) (2007) 459-76.
- Ross, D. (1969) *Style and Tradition in Catullus*. Cambridge, MA.
- Rouse, W.H.D. (1902) *Greek Votive Offerings: An Essay in the History of Greek Religion*. Cambridge.
- Rozema, B.J. (ed.) (1971) *Lucillius the epigrammatist*. Madison, WI.
- Russell, D.A. (ed.) *Dio Chrysostom: Orations VII, XII, XXXVI*. Cambridge.
- Saller, R.P. (1983) “Martial on patronage and literature” *CQ* 33(1): 246-57.

- Schatzmann, A. (2012) *Nikarchos II: Epigrammata: Einleitung, Texte, Kommentar*. Göttingen.
- Schmitz, T.A. (2010) "Speaker and addressee in early Greek epigram and lyric" in Baumbach et al. (eds.) (2010) 25-41.
- Seal, C. (2014) "Civil war and the Apollonian model in Valerius' *Argonautica*" in Augoustakis (ed.) (2014) 113-36.
- Sens, A. (2007) "One thing leads (back) to another: allusion and the invention of tradition in Hellenistic epigrams" in Bing and Bruss (eds.) (2007) 373-390.
- (2010) *Asclepiades of Samos: Epigrams and Fragments*. Oxford.
- Sfyroeras, P. (2014) "Like purple on ivory: A Homeric simile in Statius' *Achilleid*" in Augoustakis (ed.) (2014) 235-50.
- Shackleton Bailey, D.R. (1990) *M. Valerii Martialis Epigrammata*. Stuttgart.
- (1993) *Martial: Epigrams, Edited and Translated*. 3 vols. Cambridge, MA.
- Sider, D. (1997) *The Epigrams of Philodemos: Introduction, Text, and Commentary*. Oxford.
- Sistakou, E. (2007) "Glossing Homer: Homeric exegesis in early third century epigram" in Bing and Bruss (eds.) (2007) 391-408.
- Skinner, M. (2005) *Sexuality in Greek and Roman Culture*. Oxford.
- Slater, N.W. (1999) "Kalos-inscriptions and the culture of fame" in E.A. Mackay (ed.) *Signs of Orality: The Oral Tradition and its Influence in the Greek and Roman World*. Leiden: 143-61.
- Soerink, J. (2014) "Tragic / epic: Statius' *Thebaid* and Euripides' *Hypsipyle*" in Augoustakis (ed.) (2014) 171-92.
- Spisak, A. L. (1994) "Martial 6.61: Callimachean poetics revalued" *TAPA* 124: 291-308.
- (1997) "Martial's special relation with his reader" in C. Deroux (ed.) *Studies in Latin Literature and Roman History*, vol. 8. Brussels. 352-63.
- (1998) "Gift-giving in Martial" in Grewing (ed.) (1998) 243-55.
- (2007) *Martial: A Social Guide*. London.
- Sposi, F. (1997) "Archeologia e poesia in due epigramma di Marziale (2,14; 7,73)" *Atene e Roma* 42: 16-27.
- Squire, M.J. (2010) "Making Myron's cow moo?: ecphrastic epigram and the poetics of simulation" *AJPh* 131: 589-634.
- Sullivan, J.P. (1983) "Themes and variations from Martial" *Helix* 18: 47-53.
- (1991) *Martial: The Unexpected Classic*. Cambridge: 78-93, 322-27.
- (1993) "Form opposed: elegy, epigram, satire" in A. J. Boyle (ed.) *Roman Epic*. London and New York. 143-61.
- Swann, B. W. (1994) *Martial's Catullus. The Reception of an Epigrammatic Rival*. Hildesheim.
- (1998) "*Sic scribit Catullus*. The importance of Catullus for Martial's Epigrams" in Grewing (ed.) (1998) 48-58.
- Szelest, H. (1960) "Die satirische Epigramme des Martials und das griechische Epigramm." *Meander* 15: 518-30.
- (1974) "Domitian and Martial" *Eos* 62: 105-14.
- (1999) 'Ovid und Martial' in W. Schubert (ed.) *Ovid. Werk und Wirkung. Festgabe für*

- Michael von Albrecht zum 65. Geburtstag*. Frankfurt am Main (1999) 861-4.
- Tarán, S.L. (1979) *The Art of Variation in the Hellenistic Epigram*. Leiden.
- Tsagalis, C.C. (2008) *Inscribing Sorrow: Fourth-century Attic Funerary Epigrams*. Berlin.
- Tueller, M.A. (2008) *Look Who's Talking: Innovations in Voice and Identity in Hellenistic Epigram*. Leuven.
- (2010) "The passer-by in archaic and classical epigram" in Baumbach et al. (eds.) (2010) 42-60.
- Umholtz, G. (2002) "Architraval arrogance?: Dedicatory inscriptions in Greek architecture of the Classical period" *Hesperia* 71: 261-93.
- Vallat, D. (2006) "Bilingual plays on proper names in Martial" in Booth and Maltby, eds. (2006): 121-43.
- van der Keur, M. (2014) "*Meruit deus esse videri*: Silius' Homer in Homer's *Punica* 13" in Augoustakis (ed.) (2014) 287-304.
- van der Schuur, M. (2014) "Conflating funerals: The deaths of Idmon and Tiphys in Valerius' *Argonautica*" in Augoustakis (ed.) (2014) 95-112.
- Vergados, A. (2010) "Nicarchus *AP* 11, 328 and homeric interpretation" *Mnemosyne* 63: 406-423.
- von Kamptz, H. (1982) *Homerische Personennamen: Sprachwissenschaftliche und historische Klassifikation*. Göttingen.
- Wallace-Hadrill, A. (1998) "To be Roman, go Greek: Thoughts on Hellenization at Rome" in M. Austin, J. Harries, and C. Smith (eds.) (1998) *Modus Operandi: Essays in Honour of Geoffrey Rickman*. London: 79-91.
- . (2008) *Rome's Cultural Revolution*. Cambridge.
- Walsh, G. B. (1991) "Callimachean passages: the rhetoric of epitaph in epigram" *Arethusa* 24: 77-105.
- White, H. (1993) "An obscene epigram by Leonidas of Tarentum" *Habis* 24: 29-32.
- White, P. (1974) "The presentation and dedication of the *Silvae* and the *Epigrams*" *JRS* 64: 40-67.
- Willenberg, K. (1973) "Die Priapeen Martials" *Hermes* 101: 320-51.
- Williams, C. (2002a) "Ovid, Martial and poetic immortality. Traces of *Amores* 1.15 in the epigrams" *Arethusa* 35: 417-33.
- (2002b) "*Sit nequior omnibus libellis*: text, poet and reader in the epigrams of Martial" *Philologus* 146: 150-71.
- (2006) "Identified quotations and literary models: the example of Martial 2.41" in Nauta et al. (eds.) (2006) 329-48.
- Williams, Gordon (1978) *Change and Decline: Roman Literature in the Early Empire*. Berkeley.
- Williams, Gareth (2012) *The Cosmic Viewpoint: A Study of Seneca's Natural Questions*. Oxford.
- Wooten, C.W. (1977) "Cicero's reactions to Demosthenes: a clarification" *CJ* 73: 37-43.
- Zorzetti, N. (1990) "The *Carmina Convivialia*" in O. Murray (ed.) (1990) *Symptica*. Oxford: 290-307.